



2003-06-16

# A critical review of the intrinsic nature of vortex induced vibrations

Sarpkaya, Turgut

Monterey, California. Naval Postgraduate School

---


<http://hdl.handle.net/10945/15340>



Calhoun is a project of the Dudley Knox Library at NPS, furthering the precepts and goals of open government and government transparency. All information contained herein has been approved for release by the NPS Public Affairs Officer.

**Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School  
411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle  
Monterey, California USA 93943**

<http://www.nps.edu/library>



Author(s)	Sarpkaya, Turgut
Title	A critical review of the intrinsic nature of vortex induced vibrations
Publisher	Monterey, California. Naval Postgraduate School
Issue Date	2003-06-16
URL	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/10945/15340">http://hdl.handle.net/10945/15340</a>

This document was downloaded on March 11, 2013 at 11:14:06



<http://www.nps.edu/library>

Calhoun is a project of the Dudley Knox Library at NPS, furthering the precepts and goals of open government and government transparency. All information contained herein has been approved for release by the NPS Public Affairs Officer.

**Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School  
411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle  
Monterey, California USA 93943**



<http://www.nps.edu/>

NPS-ME-03-002

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE  
SCHOOL  
Monterey, California**



**A critical review  
of the intrinsic nature of  
vortex induced vibrations**

by  
**T. Sarpkaya**

16 June 2003

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

20030930 106

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL  
Monterey, California 93943-5000


RADM David R. Ellison, USN  
Superintendent

Richard Elster  
Provost

This report was prepared for The Office of Naval Research  
and funded by ONR (Code 320E).

Reproduction of all or part of this report is authorized.

This report was prepared by:



T. Sarpkaya  
Distinguished Professor  
Department of Mechanical Engineering

Reviewed by:



Anthony J. Healey  
Professor and Chairman  
Department of Mechanical Engineering

Released by:



Leonard A. Ferrari, Ph.D.  
Associate Provost and  
Dean of Research

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE <b>16 June 2003</b>	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED <b>Technical Report</b>	
A Critical Review of the Intrinsic Nature of Vortex Induced Vibrations		<b>ONR</b> (320E): <b>ONR</b> contract N00014-02-WR-20109	
6. AUTHOR(S) <b>T. SARP KAYA</b> Department of Mechanical Engineering			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER  <b>NPS-ME-03-002</b>	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Office of Naval Research, <b>ONR</b> Code 320E 800 N. Quincy St., Arlington, VA 22217		10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views and conclusions contained herein are those of the author and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the Official policies or endorsements, either expressed or implied, of the U.S. Government.			
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT  Approved for public release; distribution unlimited		12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words.)  This is a concise and comprehensive review of the progress made during the past two decades on vortex induced vibration (VIV) of mostly circular cylindrical structures subjected to steady uniform <b>flow</b> . The critical elements of the evolution of the ideas, theoretical insights, experimental methods, and numerical models are traced systematically; the strengths and weaknesses of the current state <b>of</b> the understanding of the complex fluid/structure interaction are discussed in some detail. Finally, some suggestions are made for further research on VIV. The organization of the paper <b>is</b> given at the end of the next section.			
14. SUBJECT TERMS Vortex Induced Vibration, Synchronization, Lock-in, Flow-induced oscillations, review			15. NUMBER OF PAGES: <b>130</b>
			16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT <b>UL</b>

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	1
1. Preliminary remarks	2
2. Nomenclature	7
3. Introduction	8
4. Added mass and virtual mass	20
5. Governing and influencing parameters	23
6. Linearized equations of the self-excited motion and their limitations	33
7. Unsteady force decomposition	37
8. Limitations of the forced and free vibrations	43
9. Experiments with forced oscillations	49
10. The wake and the VIV	62
11. Self-excited vibrations	70
12. VIV at high $Re$ : facts, extrapolations, and conjectures	80
13. Numerical simulations	87
14. Conclusions and recommendations	91
Acknowledgements	94
REFERENCES	95
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	112-126

# A Critical Review of the Intrinsic Nature of Vortex Induced Vibrations

T. Sarpkaya  
Naval Postgraduate School

## Abstract

This is a concise and comprehensive review of the progress made during the past two decades on vortex-induced vibration (VIV) of mostly circular cylindrical structures subjected to steady uniform flow. The critical elements of the evolution of the ideas, theoretical insights, experimental methods, and numerical models are traced systematically; the strengths and weaknesses of the current state of the understanding of the complex fluid/structure interaction are discussed in some detail. Finally, some suggestions are made for further research on VIV.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: in §1, we make some preliminary remarks about the state of the art. In §2, we introduce the nomenclature. Section 3 is an introduction to the relevant concepts and fundamental difficulties. In §4, we describe the added mass, virtual mass and their role in vortex induced oscillations. In §5, we introduce the governing and influencing parameters in as much detail as possible. In §6, the linearized equations of the self-excited motion and their limitations are discussed. In §7, a detailed discussion of the unsteady force decomposition is presented. In §8, we discuss the limitations of the forced and free vibrations. In §9, experiments with forced oscillations are presented. In §10, the wake of the circular cylinder and the vortex-induced vibrations are discussed in the light of data obtained with free and forced oscillations. In §11, the self-excited vibrations are presented. In §12, we discuss vortex-induced vibrations at high Reynolds numbers, including facts, extrapolations and conjectures. In §13, we **discuss the contributions of the numerical simulations.** Finally, in §14 we present our conclusions and recommendations for further research.

## 1. Preliminary remarks

The highly specialized subject of vortex-induced vibrations (VIV) is part of a number of disciplines, incorporating fluid mechanics, structural mechanics, vibrations, computational fluid dynamics (CFD), acoustics, wavelet transforms, complex demodulation analysis, statistics, and smart materials. They occur in many engineering situations, such as bridges, stacks, transmission lines, aircraft control surfaces, offshore structures, thermowells, engines, heat exchangers, marine cables, towed cables, drilling and production risers in petroleum production, mooring cables, moored structures, tethered structures, buoyancy and spar hulls, pipelines, cable-laying, members of jacketed structures, and other hydrodynamic and hydroacoustic applications. The most recent interest in long cylindrical members in water ensues from the development of hydrocarbon resources in depths of 1,000 m or more. In fact, the depths reached during the past 55 years increased as  $h \approx (1/540)N^{3.5}$ , where  $h$  is the depth and  $N$  is the number of years, starting with  $N = 0$  in 1949.

It cannot be emphasized strongly enough that the current state of the laboratory art concerns the interaction of a rigid body (mostly and most importantly for a circular cylinder) whose degrees of freedom have been *reduced from six to often one* (i.e., transverse motion) with a three-dimensional separated flow, dominated by large-scale vortical structures. A few exceptions in which a second degree of freedom is allowed (in the in-line direction) will be discussed later. The restrictions imposed on the physical and numerical experiments are a measure of the complexity of the self-regulated motion. It is not yet clear as to how the additional degrees of freedom will change some of the observations, measurements, numerical simulations, and the contemplated applications in all ranges of Reynolds numbers (subcritical, critical, transcritical, and supercritical).

Numerous contributions to flow-induced oscillations in general and to vortex-induced vibrations in particular have collectively defined the objectives of the current VIV research and have guided the acquisition of design data through physical and numerical experiments, theoretical analyses, and physical insight. The ultimate objective is, of course, the understanding, prediction, and prevention of vortex induced vibrations (preferably, without drag penalty) partly through the direct numerical simulations (DNS with spectral methods) of fundamental as well as



industrially significant fluid-structure interactions, by obtaining as many Navier-Stokes (N-S) data points as possible (in the desired range of the controlling parameters) and, partly, through the use of Reynolds-Averaged Navier-Stokes equations (**RANS**), Large Eddy Simulations (LES) (with improved sub-grid scale models), Vortex Element Methods (VEM), and their various combinations. As most aptly noted by Fischer and Patera (1994): "Fluid dynamics is, of course, not simply the solution of the Navier-Stokes equations for a particular configuration. Most broader problem statements, applied or fundamental, involve a vector of physical and technology-related parameters, which must be averaged over, eliminated by optimization, or varied. In all these examples, the typically rather large parameter space precludes a purely numerical solution; analytical, heuristic, and experimental data, as well as intuition, must be brought to bear if the final goals are to be achieved." In other words, the numerical simulations are to be guided and inspired by ground-breaking measurements and flow visualization, mostly with non-intrusive techniques: Digital Particle Image Velocimetry (DPIV), Laser-Doppler Velocimeter (LDV), Time Resolved PIV, pressure sensitive paints, and other means which will surely emerge in the years to come. These must be augmented with large-scale benchmark experiments to guide the numerical simulations at very large Reynolds numbers.

Much progress has been made during the past decade, both numerically and experimentally, toward the understanding of the kinematics (vice dynamics) of VIV, albeit in the *low-Reynolds number regime*. The fundamental reason for this is that VIV is not a small perturbation superimposed on a mean steady motion. VIV is an inherently nonlinear, self-governed or self-regulated, multi-degree-of-freedom phenomenon. It presents unsteady flow characteristics manifested by the existence of large-scale structures, sandwiched between two equally unsteady shear layers. There is much that is known and understood and much that remains in the empirical/descriptive realm of knowledge: What is the dominant response frequency, the range of normalized velocity, the variation of the phase angle (by which the force leads the displacement), and the response amplitude in the synchronization range as a function of the controlling and influencing parameters? Industrial applications highlight our inability to predict the dynamic response of fluid-structure interactions. They continue to require the input of the in-phase and out-of-phase components of the

lift coefficients (or the transverse force), in-line drag coefficients, correlation lengths, damping coefficients, relative roughness, shear, waves, and currents, among other governing and influencing parameters, and thus **also** require the input of relatively large safety factors. Fundamental studies as well as large-scale experiments (*whose results are disseminated in the open literature*) will provide the necessary understanding for the quantification of the relationships between the response of a structure and the governing and influencing parameters.

The difficulties experienced in describing the nature, identifying the occurrence, and predicting the characteristics of vortex induced oscillations of bluff bodies and galloping (to a lesser extent) have been reviewed by Parkinson (1974), Sarpkaya (1979), Griffin and Ramberg (1982), Bearman (1984), Parkinson (1989), Pantazopoulos (1994), Sarpkaya (1995), and in a number of books (Chen, 1987; Blevins, 1990; Naudascher and Rockwell, 1994; Sumer **and** Fredsoe, 1997; Au-Yang, 2001; Zdravkovich, 1997, **2003**, just to name a few) and, less formally, in practically every doctoral thesis, as part of the obligatory ‘previous studies’ section.

This review is not a flat chronology of scientific/engineering developments in VIV and does not attempt to refer to every work that has ever been published, but one that seeks to provide physical insight. It makes no promises that are either excessively pessimistic or unreasonably reassuring. It encourages cross-stimulation between relatively idealized physical and numerical experiments and **far** more complex technological applications, often found in books and numerous conference proceedings (see, e.g., Ziada and Staubli, 2000; Molin, 2002).

A separate section is not devoted to the discussion of flow about *fixed* bluff bodies. Reference is made only to specific fixed-body observations, measurements, computations, and deductions, as needed. The flow about *fixed* bluff bodies require and/or give rise to circumstances (influencing parameters) mostly beyond the capacity of the experimenter to control. Some of these are the finiteness of the body or the aspect ratio (as in the case of aircraft wings and ensuing end conditions), mobile separation points on curved surfaces, three-dimensional behavior over two-dimensional bodies, unpredictable (or difficult to predict) spanwise correlation, nonquantifiable growth of the disturbances in the wake, in the shear layers, and in the boundary layers (before and after separation). Furthermore, one may need to consider

the distribution of the ambient velocity and turbulence (intensity and integral length scales), blockage ratio, surface roughness, yaw, body deformation, temperature gradients, stratification, bottom and free-surface effects, and the impossibility (at the start of this century) to perform direct numerical simulations at Reynolds numbers larger than about 3,000.

In spite of most of these complex circumstances, the Strouhal number  $\{St \doteq f_{st}D/U$ , after Cenek (Vincent) Strouhal (a Czech scientist), emerges as the most robust parameter, followed by the mean base pressure whose instantaneous values can be as high as  $-0.2$  and as low as  $-3.5$ , (Zdravkovich **1997**, p. 133). Even the crudest numerical simulations or experiments predict the Strouhal number with sufficient accuracy. However, as noted by many researchers over the years, this is as much an advantage as it is an obvious shortcoming because the robust parameters do not serve as unique identification cards for the integrated effects of the individually nonquantifiable parameters. In fact, one or two parameters into which we can lump our inability to account for all the *influencing* parameters do not seem to exist. This is partly because some of the influencing parameters can become governing when they exceed certain critical values. For example, ambient turbulence may change the transition in the wake, in the separated shear layers, in the boundary *layers in the vicinity of the separation zone* (leading to possible reattachment of the flow), and in the boundary layers upstream of the mobile separation points. **Thus**, ambient turbulence (possibly quantifiable in terms of its four integral length scales and eddy-dissipation rate) may significantly affect the flow around the VIV suppression devices, and hence, may affect their performance. Then the question naturally arises as to what are a handful of parameters that could possibly serve (albeit imperfectly) as unique identification cards for the intended purpose. The most obvious candidates are those that exhibit large scatter in every experiment (confining ourselves to steady flow about smooth circular cylinders).

Measurements during the past century identified the fluctuating lift in steady flow about a cylinder at rest as the most likely quantifier of the combined effect of the influencing parameters; e.g., see Norberg (**2003**) and references cited therein. Thus, having a representative time record of the lift force and its **complex demodulation** analysis, in addition to the spectra and the r.m.s. (root-mean-square) value of lift,

would be most desirable. As noted above, it would be equally desirable to have a measure of the turbulence distribution, eddy-dissipation rate, and the integral length scales ( $x$ ,  $y$ ,  $z$ , and  $t$ ) of the ambient flow. As to the flow around the cylinder, the extension of the current understanding of the Gerrard-Bloor transition waves and their disappearance in the range of Reynolds numbers from about  $Re \cong 2 \times 10^4$  to  $5 \times 10^4$  (Bloor, 1964; Bloor and Gerrard, 1966; Gerrard, 1978; Zdravkovich, 1997; Norberg, 2003) to unsteady flows would be quite valuable.

Measurements similar to those noted above are equally desirable for a VIV body undergoing forced or self-excited oscillations in steady uniform or sheared flows. It appears that for such flows the fluctuating lift and the phase angle (between the total force and the displacement) or the 'in-phase' and 'out-of-phase' components of the transverse force could serve as suitable identification cards for the integrated effects of some of the important parameters, e.g., to assess the effects of Reynolds number on the correlation length along the cylinder, on the wake modes, and on the state of transition-to-turbulence in the free-shear layers emanating from a cylinder undergoing VIV at a given  $A/D$  for a range of  $Re$  or at a given  $Re$  for a range of  $A/D$ . However desirable, the sensitivity of the transition waves to VIV has not yet been investigated. Apparently, direct measurements will be a formidable task. Evidence, albeit indirectly, must be gathered to identify, for example, wake and response phenomena which occur only at relatively small Reynolds numbers.

The character of the separation, more specifically, the excursions of the separation point (the mean angle plus fluctuations), their dependence on surface conditions, the upstream turbulence, the motion of the cylinder, the frequency spectrum of the fluctuations of the separation angle require serious investigation, particularly for comparison with direct numerical simulations of VIV *using simulated ambient turbulent flow*. In summary, it is interesting to note that a phenomenon as robust as the vortex shedding gives rise to forces as unpredictable as the lift force whose power can be fully appreciated only when one tries to eliminate VIV without excising the after body. In fact, it may be more advantageous to predict and thereby to avoid the vortex induced vibrations than to attempt to eliminate them. After all, the fluctuating lift will always be there, with or without VIV, and the pure circular cylinder will always be the preferred shape.

## 2 Nomenclature

As all disciples of VIV know, the literature is rife with too many  $f$ 's. It is not unusual to find papers in which as many as three different symbols are used to denote one specific frequency. The reading of many papers is made difficult partly because the subscripts do not help one to immediately recognize what they represent and partly because the same author uses a new set of  $f$ 's in his follow-on paper. The major parameters should be equally applicable to both forced and self-excited oscillations in physical and numerical experiments. The use of parameters that are part of the problem (rather than part of the solution) further complicates the matter and does not allow one to make comparisons with numerical simulations. The advent of powerful computers has increasingly forced the formulation of the VIV problems in mathematical and CFD terms. With these thoughts in mind, we purposely choose two- or three-letter subscripts to enhance the instant recognition of the most important symbols.

$f_{vac}$ : the frequency measured in vacuum, as the only natural frequency [ $f_{vac} = (1/2\pi)(k/m)^{1/2}$ ], where  $k$  denotes the linear spring constant and ' $m$ ' the mass of the oscillating body. Its relation to the frequency measured in air and water will be discussed later.

$f_{ex}$ : the frequency of oscillation of a (forced or self-excited) body, meaning *the excitation frequency*, regardless of whether there is lock-in or not. At lock-in  $f_{ex} = f_{com}$  (the common frequency),  $(1/2\pi)[k/(m + \Delta m)]^{1/2}$ .

$f_{st}$ : the vortex shedding frequency (or the Strouhal frequency) *of a body at rest*. It is uniquely related to the velocity of the flow and the characteristic size of the body through the Strouhal number  $St = f_{st} D/U$  where  $U$  is the steady ambient velocity of the uniform flow.

$f_{vs}$ : the vortex shedding frequency of *a body in motion* (forced or self-excited). In the lock-in range,  $f_{vs}$  becomes increasingly smaller than  $f_{st}$  until the lock-out.

A cylinder may be *forced* to oscillate at any frequency and amplitude within reason. Furthermore, one is at liberty to change the frequency and/or the amplitude **content** of the oscillations. Outside the synchronization region(s) the force experienced by the body will have both the Strouhal and body oscillation frequencies.

In other words, it is understood that in the periodic- and quasi-periodic non-lock-in regions, the two frequencies ( $f_{st}$  and  $f_{ex}$ ) will appear awhile, and then, at a slightly higher frequency, the synchronization will occur, leaving only one frequency, i.e.,  $f_{com} = f_{ex}$ . However, one must hasten to note that in self-excited oscillations one should not expect perfect synchronization because of the continuous interaction between the body and the fluctuations of added-mass, amplitude, correlation-length, and the phase angle. This is distinct from the *beating motion* of a cable undergoing amplitude-modulated oscillations by excitation at two or more frequencies wherein the vortex shedding frequency alternates between the imposed frequency and the Strouhal frequency (see, e.g., Nakano and Rockwell, 1991).

The following are identified as the most important dimensionless parameters:  $Re = UD/\nu$ ,  $f_{com}/f_{st}$  or  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$  or  $(1/V_r St)$ ,  $f_{ex}/f_{vac}$ ,  $V_r = U/f_{ex}D$ ,  $(1/V_r) = f_{ex}D/U$ ,  $V_r St = f_{st}/f_{ex}$ . Finally,  $f_{wtr}$  and  $f_{air}$  will be introduced for those in dire need of a frequency in still water or in still air. Additional parameters, controlling and influencing VIV, will be discussed later.

### 3. Introduction

An all-inclusive definition of a self-exciting or, better, self-regulating ‘Bluff body’ does not exist. It can be described only in general terms by relying on the readers’ imagination. It is an elastic or elastically-mounted fore-and-aft body of proper mass and damping whose cross-section facing the ambient flow at high-enough Reynolds numbers gives rise to separated flow and hence to two shear layers, which interact with each other and bound an unsteady wake. **A** body with no aft section (e.g., a **D** section with a flow from *right to left*) behaves like a bluff body but does not present an aft profile on which the alternating lift force can act. For the purpose of this review, a body capable of giving rise to VIV will be called a ‘VIV-Body.’

Numerous experiments have shown that a VIV-body (e.g., a circular- or square-section cylinder) with material damping  $\xi$ , (determined in vacuum, especially for sharp-edged bodies) and proper reduced mass  $m^* = (m/L)/(\rho_f \pi D^2/4)$ , or  $m^* = \rho_m/\rho_f$  with  $\rho_m = (m/L)/(\pi D^2/4)$  as the ‘mean mass density,’ may be excited by the vortices it sheds if it is mounted on springs and exposed to a steady uniform flow. When the

prevailing vortex shedding frequency  $f_{vs}$  (not always close to  $f_{st}$ ) and the excitation frequency  $f_{ex}$  of the body approach a common frequency  $f_{com}$ , the body begins to experience relatively small vortex induced oscillations. These are controlled by the spring constant, body mass, structural damping, the density and the motion of the fluid surrounding the body, plus a number of difficult-to-quantify influencing parameters  $Sp$ , to be called Schewe parameters (1983). This is followed by a substantial increase of the coherence length (Koopman, 1967a; Ferguson and Parkinson, 1967; Toebe, 1969; Ramberg and Griffin, 1976 (for oscillating cylinders); Mansy, Yang and Williams (1994) (for stationary cylinders); and Novak and Tanaka, 1975 (in smooth flow).

The vortex excited oscillations increase the vortex strength (Davies, 1976; Atsavapranee, Benaroya, and Wei, 1998) when the amplitude in the transverse direction exceeds a threshold value of about  $0.1D$ , (it is about 0.020 for the in-line oscillations, see. e.g., Mandini, 1961; Sainsbury and King, 1971; Dickens, 1979; Okajima et al., 2002; Sugimoto, et al., 2002, and the references cited therein). The ratio of the circulation of the nascent vortex to that of the shed vortex is about  $\Gamma/\Gamma_o = 0.51 \pm 0.08$  for the stationary cylinder (Atsavapranee et al., 1998) in agreement with those reported in the literature (Berger and Wille, 1972). For the cylinder oscillating in the lock-in range ( $V_r = U/f_{ex}D \approx 4$  to 8), the ratio of the vortex strength to the total supply of circulation in one shedding period  $\Gamma/\Gamma_o$  is found to be  $0.66 \pm 0.09$ . This conforms Sarpkaya's findings (1963) in accelerating flow about cylinders.

If the velocity  $U$  and hence the amplitude are increased (gradually) to new values, the diameter 'seen' by the flow (or the spacing between the shear layers defining the virtual body) increases initially, *at least for small amplitudes* (see, e.g., Di Silvio 1969). The apparent 'increase' in  $D$  is compensated by the real increase in velocity  $U$ , thus keeping the vortex shedding frequency nearly constant. This represents a departure from the vortex shedding frequency of the fixed cylinder at the new (increased) ambient flow velocity. In other words, the self-excitation begins with a *real decrease in the frequency of vortex shedding* to a value close to  $f_{com}$ , which may be close to but not equal to that obtained from pluck tests in still water. The vortex-shedding mode and frequency change most to match  $f_{com}$ . Apparently, the body motion is dominant (but not invariant) in the sense that it accommodates somewhat

the changes in vortex shedding by letting the flow change its virtual mass and hence its frequency and acceleration as both the flow and the body arrive at a common frequency to which the body responds with exuberance: the matching of the frequency of the prevailing dynamics of the vortical wake with the frequency of the body oscillation.

Figures 1 and 2 show **two** interesting examples. The first (Fig. 1, after Feng, 1968) was conducted in air with a single-degree-of freedom flexible cylinder with a relatively large mass ( $m^* = \rho_m/\rho_{air} = 248$ ,  $\zeta = 0.00103$ ,  $m^*\zeta = 0.255$ ) and relatively large Re, *varying with*  $V_r = U/f_{air}D$ , from  $10^4$  to  $5 \times 10^4$ . The second, Fig. 2, compares Feng's data with those obtained by Khalak and Williamson (1999, hereafter referred to as KW) in water with a single-degree-of freedom flexible cylinder ~~with~~ a relatively small mass ( $m^* = \rho_m/\rho_{wtr} = 10.1$ ,  $\zeta = 0.0013$  and  $m^*\zeta = 0.013$ ) and smaller Re. In both self-excited cases, the Reynolds number increases along the  $V_r$  axis because  $f_{air}$ ,  $f_{wtr}$ , and  $D$  are kept constant and only  $U$  or Re is allowed to vary as prescribed. This is unlike the forced oscillation experiments in which Re *is* kept *constant* and the frequency of excitation is varied. KW (1999) stated that "our studies here and in Govardhan & Williamson (2000), for Re = 3,500-10,000, indicate that it is principally the parameter ( $m^*\zeta$ ), which influences whether the upper branch will appear or not." The existing facts do not support their assumption for a number of reasons: (a) for *steady flow* about *a stationary cylinder*, the 'eddy formation length,'  $L_f$ , shrinks from  $L_f \approx 1.9D$  at Re =  $5 \times 10^3$  to  $L_f \approx 1.1D$  at Re =  $14 \times 10^3$  and the distance to the center of the transition region (transition from a laminar to a turbulent free shear layer) decreases from about  $L_t \approx D$  to  $L_t \approx 0.4D$  (Zdravkovich, 1997). These change the character of the free shear layers and hence that of the vortices emanating from them. In fact, Zdravkovich (1990) was the first to suggest that the occurrence of a jump to an upper branch in Meier-Windhorst experiments (1939) might be a Reynolds number effect. Clearly, the physics of the shear layers, in general, and that of the unsteady shear layers, in particular, is very complex. For this reason the sensitivity of the transition waves due to VIV (even for a single-degree of freedom) has not yet been directly investigated. However, the experiments of Carberry (2002) and Carberry et al. (2002) with oscillating cylinders (with Reynolds numbers in the same range **as** that **of** KW) provide direct evidence to show that the phase angle  $\phi$  and, in particular, the lift coefficient  $C_L$ , significantly increase (as much as 100%) with






Fig. 1. Response and wake characteristics of a spring-mounted cylinder freely oscillating in air :  $m^* = 245$ ,  $\zeta = 0.00103$ ,  $m^*\zeta = 0.255$ , and  $Re$  (varying with  $V_r = U/f_{air}D$ ) from  $10^4$  to  $5 \times 10^4$  (Feng, 1965).




Fig. 2. A comparison of Feng's maximum  $A/D$  versus  $f_{ex}/f_{air}$  data, (Fig. 1), with those obtained by Khalak and Williamson (1999) in water with a single degree of freedom flexible cylinder ( $m^* = 10.1$ ,  $\zeta = 0.0013$ ,  $m^*\zeta = 0.013$ , and  $Re$  varying from  $3 \times 10^3$  to

branches (initial and lower). The Khalak and Williamson data ( $A/D$  versus  $U/f_{wir}D$ ) has three branches (initial, upper, and lower), a much

increasing Reynolds number ( $Re = 2,300, 4,400, \text{ and } 9,100$ ) for a given  $A/D$ , and with  $A/D$  for a given Reynolds number (up to  $A/D$  values of about 0.5).

Feng's data ( $A/D$  and phase  $\phi$  versus  $U/f_{air}D$ ), at higher Reynolds numbers ( $10^4$  to  $5 \times 10^4$ ), have only two branches (initial and lower). The KW (1999) data ( $A/D$  versus  $U/f_{wtr}D$ ), at lower Reynolds numbers (3,500-10,000) has three branches (initial, upper, and lower), a much larger peak amplitude, and a broader synchronization range. It must be emphasized that the horizontal axis in both figures denotes  $U/f_{air}D$  and  $U/f_{wtr}D$ , as well as the increasing Reynolds number,  $Re = UD/\nu$ . In all such free VIV experiments the frequency  $f_{air}$  (or  $f_{wtr}$ ) and  $D$  are kept constant (along with  $m^*$  and  $\zeta$ ) and the variation of  $A/D$  with  $U$  or with the Reynolds number is plotted from a minimum to a maximum  $Re$ . Evidently,  $Re$  may be kept constant by maintaining  $U$ ,  $D$ ,  $L/D$ ,  $k$ ,  $\zeta$ ,  $\rho_f$  and  $\nu$  constant and varying only  $m$  in  $\rho_m = 4m/(\pi LD^2)$  and hence  $f_{vac}$  in  $V_r = U/f_{vac}D$  or in  $f_{ex}/f_{vac}$ . Such experiments, which constitute the essence of our on-going VIV research, will define a 3-D space showing  $A/D$  versus  $f_{ex}/f_{vac}$  in each plane of constant  $Re$ . This will enhance the understanding of the various regimes and their dependence on Reynolds number, shear layer instability, mass ratio or  $\rho_m/\rho_{wtr}$ , material damping, aspect ratio, modes of vibration, modes of vortex shedding, abrupt as well as gradual changes in the phase, and the degrees of freedom, along with several other parameters, to be discussed later.

As noted by Huerre (2002), "vortex shedding is represented by a global *mode*, i.e., a self-sustained time-periodic state characterized by a specific spatial structure and a frequency, which is the same throughout the flow domain." The freedom provided to a body through elastic mounting is capable of modifying the character of the global mode, i.e., modifying both the frequency and the spatial structure of the *near wake*. In any case, the body vibrates neither *at*  $f_{wtr}$  (for VIVs in water), nor *at*  $f_{air}$  (for VIVs in air), nor *at*  $f_{st}$  of the fixed body. Surprisingly, synchronization (sometimes referred to as the lock-in, lock-on, vortex capture, or frequency capture) occurs not only near  $f_{st}$ , but also over a wide range of flow velocities. It appears that 'lock-in' or 'lock-on,' 'vortex capture', or 'frequency capture' are misnomers. In fact, one needs to redefine VIV to make a distinction between the two distinct roles, *excitation and driving*, played by vortices.

Excitation means that the vortices can and do excite the body, even when the out-of-phase component of their lift force is relatively small (in comparison to mechanical restoring force), provided that their shedding frequency  $f_{vs}$  is close to the prevailing frequency of the body. This is like a single degree of freedom system with small (but none zero) viscous damping. Thus, even weak vortices in some regions of  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$  can excite a body to large amplitudes when the body and the vortices arrive at a common frequency  $f_{com}$ , (in the region of  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$  from about 0.5 to 0.9).

The driving ability of the vortices ensues from their particular modal dynamics to give rise to a sufficiently large out-of-phase lift component in certain regions of  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$  (from about 0.9 to 1.0). Thus, the excitation function of the vortices is a mandatory requirement for the inception and maintenance of VIV. However, the effectiveness of their driving function depends on a number of parameters (the range of  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$ , Reynolds number, damping, virtual mass of the oscillating system, and some influencing parameters).

It is clear from the foregoing that to sustain a self-excited, self-limiting resonant response, the motion of a freely-vibrating VIV-body interferes at proper amplitudes and frequencies with the mutual interaction of the shear layers and becomes a dominant part of the overall instability mechanism: shear-layer interaction leading to vortex shedding, leading to alternating transverse and modulated in-line forces, leading to body motion, leading toward the common frequencies of the excitation and response in respective directions. Thus, the interaction of the body and the flow under proper conditions serves as the magnifier, organizer, and synchronizer of the phenomenon. It is not ever likely to happen at a constant amplitude and frequency for the freely oscillating bodies because of the significant amplitude/frequency/added-mass modulations. In the words of one of the pioneers (Gary H. Koopmann, 1967a) "when the wind velocity approaches the boundaries of the resonant region, the shedding frequencies are close enough to the natural frequency of the system to cause the system to respond in short bursts of periodic motion in the plane to the direction of the wind. If the motion during one of these bursts is large enough to correlate the vortex wake along the span, the cylinder jumps to a higher displacement amplitude than before and a steady-state oscillation follows. Once inside this instability boundary, the cylinder motion controls the wake frequency and the resulting

oscillation takes place at the natural frequency of the system.” In addition, “as the wind velocity is slowly increased in the resonant region, the displacement amplitude of the cylinder steadily increases until at some definite velocity, a peak displacement amplitude is reached.”

Cheng and Moretti (1991) conducted a series of experiments with a circular cylinder subjected to forced transverse vibration in a uniform cross-flow at Reynolds numbers of **1,500** and **1,650**. They have measured the prevailing vortex *shedding frequency*  $f_{vs}$  with hot-film probes, placed **4D** downstream and **2.50** across from the center of the cylinder. They have varied  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$  (driving frequency/Strouhal frequency for a stationary cylinder) from zero to **4.5** and the amplitude  $A/D$  from zero to **0.75**. The driving frequency was monotonically increased to avoid hysteresis effects. Figure 3 (for  $A/D = 0.05$ ,  $Re = 1,500$  and for  $A/D = 0.235$ ,  $Re = 1,500$ ) show representative data identifying the relevant sub-harmonic, non-harmonic, and super-harmonic wake frequencies. When  $f_{vs}$  is near  $f_{st}$ , on a horizontal line given by  $f_{vs}/f_{st} = 1$ ,  $f_{vs}$  is unaffected by the excitation. However, when  $f_{vs}$  falls on a line from the origin with a slope of unity, the vortex structure in the wake locks onto the excitation frequency ( $f_{vs}/f_{st} \approx 0.5$  to **1.6**). A further observation is made that  $f_{vs}$  tends to decline with increasing excitation, possibly due to the widening of the wake. A more recent set of data (Fig. 4) by Krishnamoorthy et al. (2001) shows the wake frequencies as a function of the oscillation frequency, vortex shedding frequency, and remaining wake frequencies for  $A/D = 0.22$  and  $Re = 1,500$ . Cheng and Moretti (1991) found that the lock-in range exhibits an onion-shaped region as shown in Fig. 5a. At small amplitudes, this dependence is essentially the same as that found by Koopmann (1967b) and Bublitz (1972). The center frequency of the lock-in is slanted toward lower frequencies, and the Reynolds number has a strong effect on the upper frequency lock-in boundary.

Vickery and Watkins (1962), Hartlen, Baines, and Cume (1968), Blevins and Burton (1976), and Pantazopoulos (1994) have provided extensive data for  $A/D$  versus the lift coefficient  $C_L$  for a variety of conditions. Figure 5(b) shows that  $C_L$  increases with  $A/D$  up to  $A/D \approx 0.5$  and then decreases rapidly with increasing  $A/D$ . The comparison of Figs 5(a) and 5(b) shows that at large  $A/D$  the lock-in range is narrow and  $C_L$  is relatively small (weak vortices). If  $A/D$  is reduced (e.g., by a strake




Fig. 3 Variation of the shedding frequency with driving frequency of a single cylinder in uniform flow; (a)  $A/D = 0.05$ ,  $Re = 1500$ ; and (b)  $A/D = 0.235$ ,  $Re = 1500$ . (Cheng and Moretti, 1991).




Fig. 4. The normalized wake frequencies as a function of the normalized oscillation frequency, vortex shedding frequency, and remaining wake frequencies for  $A/D = 0.22$  and  $Re = 1500$ . (Krishnamoorthy, Price, and Paidoussis, 2001).




Fig. 5(a). The lock-in range exhibits an onion-shaped region ( $A/D = 0.22$ ,  $Re = 1500$ ). The center frequency of the **lock-in** is slanted towards lower frequencies. (Cheng and Moretti, 1991).




Fig. 5(b). Lift coefficient for a pivoted rod at resonance:  $\square$ ,  $L/D = 48$ , and  $\Delta$ ,  $L/D = 15$ , Vickery and Watkins (1962);  $\circ$ ,  $L/D = 13.8$ , Hartlen et al. (1968). Curvefit by Blevins and Burton (1976). More extensive  $C_L$  data for spring-supported cylinders and cantilevers are tabulated by Pantazopoulos (1994).

or a similar passive-suppression device *in water*, with relatively little effort), the motion moves in the direction of rapidly increasing  $C_L$  and increasing lock-in range. This stiffens the resistance to further reduction in  $A/D$  because of the ever increasing strength and coherence of the vortices shed by the cylinder. In other words, the ability of the suppression device to breakup the coherence and to overcome the strong lift forces is rendered increasingly ineffective. Consequently, the suppression device cannot reduce  $A/D$  to values smaller than about 0.5 in a wider lock-in range. If the maximum  $A/D$  of the cylinder is about 0.7 (*in air*) to begin with, the vortices are as

strong and correlated as they will ever be. Any decrease in coherence caused by the suppression device further decreases  $C_L$  in a narrowing range of lock-in, eventually suppressing the oscillations. Clearly, the phenomenon is far more complex and the suppression achievable in air or in water depends on the Reynolds number, end conditions, and the type, relative size, and configuration of the passive device used.

For long, rigid or flexible structures (e.g., a cable), the phenomenon is further complicated by the fact that the structure tends to respond at a variety of frequencies over its entire length. This, in turn, gives rise to additional and omni-directional fluid forces whose prediction is at best approximate. When there is no synchronization (lock-in), the driving fluid force and the structure oscillate at their own frequencies. In field tests, a locked-in condition or a standing wave profile may not occur on long wires towed in the ocean (Alexander, **1981**). There is no total spanwise correlation along very long structures placed in the ocean environment partly because cooperating instabilities prevent such coherence, even in well-controlled laboratory experiments, and partly because larger amplitude disturbances and omni-directional waves and currents surely prevent anything other than short coherence lengths (an extensive table is given by Pantazopoulos, **1994**). Only the relatively short test cylinders or cables result in well-separated modal frequencies, reducing the effects of modal interaction and enabling single-mode lock-in to be studied in some detail (Iwan and Jones, **1987**). A fitting summary of the foregoing is given by Kim et al. (**1986**): "Multimoded non-lock-in response did occur when the mean shedding frequency fell between natural frequencies. At these times, three or four modes were present in the cross-flow response. The in-line response would at the same time have several modes. Under lock-in conditions, the excitation bandwidth is very narrow. Under non-lock-in conditions, even with very uniform flow, the excitation bandwidth broadens substantially. Under such circumstances, the lift force is best characterized as a narrow band random process with sufficient bandwidth to excite two or more adjacent modes. Lock-in occurs if and only if the separation of the natural frequencies of the cylinder are large compared to the bandwidth of vortex-induced forces." Clearly, the vortex shedding, the character and timing of the vortices and the amplification of the driving force are inextricably related. Also, self-excitation without lock-in is common but self-regulated lock-in without self-excitation is impossible.

If a cylinder is free to oscillate in both the transverse and in-line directions, the common frequencies of the body and the driving forces in their respective directions may lead to lock-in and the axis of the body traces the path of figure *eights* (Moe and Wu, 1990; and Moe, et al., 1994; Sarpkaya, 1995). The figure-eight loop is caused by the considerable variation of drag force during large amplitude oscillation. Dye (1978) tested a cantilevered cylinder in water and made the following observations: "During the swing of a cylinder from a dead-end, the wake is tilted and the projected drag in the velocity direction is reduced. Once the dead-end is reached, the wake realigns with the velocity and the drag force is increased. The cylinder is pushed back along the maximum amplitude line before the wake becomes tilted again." Zdravkovich (1990) noted that "the two-degree-of-freedom response is the interaction of the streamwise synchronization at  $V_r = U/f_{ex}D \approx 2.5$  with the transverse synchronization at  $V_r \approx 5$ ". It is a well-known fact that (see, e.g., Sarpkaya, 1979) for  $1.7 < V_r < 2.3$  (the so-called first instability region) oscillations occur in the in-line direction and the vortices are shed symmetrically. In the interval  $2.8 < V_r < 3.2$ , (the second instability region), the vortices are shed alternately. Chen and Jendrzejczyk (1979), working with a cantilevered tube in water, varied the reduced velocity from 1.92 to 4.92. He found 'beating,' typical of the pre-synchronization at  $V_r = 4.53$ , as shown in Fig. 6. A single-degree-of freedom system is inhibited from exhibiting these intricate variations.

The mobility of the separation points is important but not necessary for synchronization (e.g., for a square or rectangular cylinder). The separation points on a smooth *stationary* circular cylinder trace an arc whose magnitude depends on Re and the frequency and amplitude of the flow oscillation (Sarpkaya and Butterworth, 1992; Sarpkaya, 2002). It is understood that the characteristics of turbulence of the approaching flow at each cycle depends on the energy stored in the fluid and is not independently controllable. In general, the point of separation on a cylinder depends not only on the pressure gradient but also on the type of unsteadiness of the ambient flow (e.g., sinusoidal), turbulence upstream of the separation points, roughness of the surface or other excrescencies, symmetry or the asymmetry of the cylinder, taper along the cylinder, presence of salient edges, and the mode of vortex (or vorticity) shedding. For a cylinder undergoing VIV, the actual instantaneous value of the wake angle is greater than that between the ambient flow velocity and the relative fluid






Fig. 6. A cantilevered tube in water with reduced velocities from 1.92 (top) to 4.92 (at the bottom). The 'beating' mode is typical of the pre-synchronization at  $V_r = 4.53$ . A single-degree-of freedom system is inhibited from exhibiting these intricate variations. (Chen and Jendrzejczyk, 1979).

velocity (Mei and Currie, 1969; Raudkivi and Small, 1974) and the oscillation of a cylinder enhances both the strength of the vortices and the excursions of the separation points. Detailed discussions of the oscillation of bodies with salient edges may be found, for example, in Ongoren and Rockwell (1988a,b), Lotfy and Rockwell (1993), Deniz and Staubli (1997, 1998), and in the numerous references cited therein.

The lock-in also occurs at excitations that are superharmonics of the shedding frequency (see, Figs. 3 and 4). Furthermore, the lock-in regions for the odd-number superharmonics appear to differ from those for the even-number superharmonics (Olinger and Sreenivasan, 1988; Cheng and Moretti, 1991; Rodriguez and Pruvost, 2000). This is undoubtedly related to the nature of the shedding of the vortices.

In the following, we will discuss a number of fundamental topics which are inextricably related to VIV and which are of major importance to understanding the

intricate relationships between the governing parameters and the observed or predicted dynamics of the oscillating system.

#### 4. Added mass and virtual mass

Added mass is one of the best known, least understood, and most confused characteristic of fluid dynamics. It exists in all flows about bluff bodies. However, it *manifests its existence*, like all masses, only when it is accelerated. It depends on the type of motion of the body or the fluid about the body and its wake, proximity of other bodies, free surface, and time. It can be plus, it can be minus, depending on the relative direction of the *drift*. Its inviscid-flow values (tabulated in books **and** special reports) often give the impression that they are applicable to all unsteady *viscous* flows at all Reynolds numbers. Such an impression is so prevalent that one often encounters general force expressions or force decompositions for viscous flows using a velocity-square-dependent drag force plus and an *ideal inertial* force or frequency expressions using the mass of the body plus **the** ideal added mass [using  $C_a = (\text{added mass} / \text{displaced mass}) = 1$  for a cylinder]. This is in spite of the fact that Stokes (1851) showed almost 150 years ago that viscosity does affect the added mass (even in simpler flows) and that if the ideal inertial force is subtracted from the total force it still leaves some inertial force in the so-called ‘vortex force.’ In other words, in unsteady flows neither is the drag equal to its state-state value nor is the added mass equal to its inviscid flow value, both are affected by viscosity and acceleration (Sarpkaya, 2001).

The effect of the smooth evolution of the unsteady viscous flow is expressed by Basset (1888) with a ‘history term,’ which yields exactly the same result as the viscosity-dependent terms in Stokes’ solution, but draws attention to the fact that unsteady flow is not a juxtaposition of instantaneous steady states. Only if the body is started from rest in a fluid otherwise at rest, the initial value of the added mass is in agreement with its ideal value because the vorticity is still confined to a thin sheet on the boundary. Sometimes this very special case is used to ‘prove’ that the added mass coefficient  $C_a$  for a circular cylinder is ‘always’ equal to unity. There is, of course, nothing **wrong** with the proof **as long as** it is not generalized **to viscous flows** for times greater than an infinitesimally small **At**. Even though Stokes’ solution is valid

only for unseparated laminar flows at small Reynolds numbers and amplitudes, the fundamental concepts gleaned from it are universally applicable to all unsteady flows about bluff bodies and to all **21** independent components of the added mass coefficient.

The added mass has several applications besides those of the problem of acceleration from rest. As examples of such applications, the following may be cited: correcting the measured drag coefficient in wind tunnels with diverging walls (due to convective or both convective and local acceleration), estimating the aerodynamic forces in cases of buffeting and flutter, calculating the periods of heaving, pitching, and rolling motions of a ship, and, in general, in calculating forces and accelerations wherever the kinetic energy imparted to the fluid by the body is not negligible relative to the kinetic energy of the body itself.

The added mass may be quantified in other ways besides the use of kinetic energy. Riecke (**1888**) surmised and, subsequently, Sir Charles Darwin (**1953**) made his celebrated discovery that the added mass for a body translating uniformly in an infinite expanse of perfect fluid equals the drift-volume times the density of the fluid. The drift mass (similar to the drift mass in Stokes waves) is displaced permanently in the direction of motion of the body. Darwin and, subsequently, Benjamin (**1986**) showed that the individual fluid particles, which are pushed aside by the body in its forward motion, do not return to their former positions. The paths of the individual particles are not closed curves but open-ended elasticas. Hence, besides pushing the particles aside temporarily in passing, the cylinder **also** displaces the fluid particles permanently in the direction of its motion. This permanently displaced fluid mass, enclosed between the initial and final positions of the fluid particles, is in fact the added mass itself for the inviscid flow. The calculation of the drift mass for a separated viscous flow is exceedingly complex. It can be achieved only for special unsteady flows (as in the case **of** Stokes solution) or experimentally, as will be seen later. Interestingly, the drift mass is associated with the name of the grandson of the creator of the theory of evolution.

It follows from the foregoing that the added mass is not a concentrated mass attached to the centroid of the body. It is distributed throughout the fluid set in motion by the body. Thus, its magnitude and centroid change with time as the

intensity and distribution of the kinetic energy of the fluid change with time. For the numerical experiments, one does not need to know the added mass since the pressure and the viscous contributions are explicitly incorporated into the solutions of the N-S equations. However, one does not have a larger range of Reynolds numbers from which to choose. Furthermore, VIV is not a small perturbation superimposed on a mean steady motion. It presents strong unsteady flow characteristics manifested by the existence of large-scale structures for which the use of standard turbulence models in RANS, LES, and DVM simulations is highly questionable.

The cycle-averaged added mass coefficient  $C_a (= \Delta m / \rho_f V_b)$ , where  $\rho_f$  is the density of fluid and  $V_b$  is a suitable reference volume, can be negative, with far reaching consequences for freely-vibrating cylinders with low mass ratio  $m^* (= \rho_m / \rho_f)$ , because

$$C_a / m^* = (\Delta m / m) = C_a \rho_f / \rho_s \quad (1a)$$

may approach -1 and the *normalized virtual mass*

$$(m + \Delta m) / m = (1 + C_a / m^*) \quad (1b)$$

may approach zero, resulting in an oscillating cylinder with no apparent or virtual mass. It has been noted, e.g., by Feng (1968), Bishop and Hassan (1964), and Sarpkaya (1979), among others, that *the transverse force needed to excite a cylinder to large amplitude oscillations is far greater than that exerted by vortex shedding*. It was not clear in the 1970's that the virtual mass of the body may decrease to very small values. The high-mass ratio cylinders are obviously less affected by the added mass and its variations. In fact, the significance of several parameters stands out only at lower mass ratios. These issues will be discussed in more detail later.

It follows from the foregoing that in separated time-dependent flows (such as VIV), the common frequency (between the body and the vortices) at lock-in, cannot remain constant throughout the synchronization range because the added mass is a function of time, the shape of the body and its surroundings, and the type of motion and orientation of the body through the fluid. For reference purposes, we note that the negative added mass has been previously discussed a number of times (see, e.g., Keulegan and Carpenter, 1958; Sarpkaya, 1963, 1976a, 1976b, 1977a, 1986a, b;

Vandiver, 1993; Vikestad et al., 2000) and will be discussed again in Section 9. The negative added mass occurs mostly in the approximate range of  $0.5 < f_{ex}/f_{st} < 0.85$  where  $f_{com}/f_{vac} > 1$ , the phase angle and amplitudes are relatively large, and two pairs of vortices are shed per cycle (to be discussed later). A similar occurrence of negative added mass in transverse vortex shedding, from a cylinder undergoing sinusoidal oscillations in a fluid otherwise at rest, has been evaluated and discussed in great detail by Sarpkaya (1977a).

Subsequently, it will become clear that the fluctuations of the added mass hold the key to understanding the similarities and differences between the forced and self-excited vibrations. The fluctuations of the amplitude of self-excited oscillations (about  $\pm 10\%$ ) impose higher-order harmonics on the cyclic variation of the added mass. This, in turn, leads to fluctuations in frequency. Their combined effect leads to further changes in amplitude, added mass, frequency, coherence length, phase angle and so on. Clearly, if one can eliminate the modulations superimposed on the cyclic variation of the added mass in self-excited vibrations, one will maintain its amplitude and frequency constant and thus make the motion behave more like a forced vibration. When no two cycles are alike, one should expect a large variety of wake states as the motion transitions from a *high lift-phase state* to a *low lift-phase state* (sometimes, mistakenly called ‘low-frequency’ and ‘high-frequency’ states, even though the frequency changes only slightly between the two states). What is of course remarkable in VIV is that a small change in frequency (say,  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$  or  $f_{com}/f_{st}$ ) may cause rather large changes in phase, in wake structure, and thus, in all the attendant consequences of VIV in or out of lock-in.

## 5. Governing and influencing parameters

A simple dimensional analysis shows that the parameters ‘controlling’ the transverse vortex-induced oscillations of a cylinder are the density of fluid  $\rho_f$ , dynamic viscosity  $\mu_f$ , velocity of the ambient flow  $U$ , diameter of the cylinder  $D$ , length of the cylinder  $L$ , spring constant  $k$ , mean roughness height of the cylinder  $k_s$ , structural damping factor  $\zeta$ , mass of the body  $m$  (with no added mass), mean shear  $dU/dy$ , cylinder taper  $dD/dy$ , characteristic turbulence intensity  $\epsilon_t$  and the integral

length scales  $I_{ils}$  of the ambient flow, and Schewe parameters  $Sp$ . Then the normalized amplitude may be written as,

$$\frac{A}{D} = F \left\{ \zeta, \frac{\rho_f U D}{\mu_f}, \frac{L}{D}, \frac{4m}{\rho_f \pi L D^2}, \frac{D}{U} \left( \frac{k}{m} \right)^{1/2}, Re_{sl}, \right. \\ \left. Re_{cr}, \frac{D}{U_o^2} \frac{dU}{dt}, \frac{D}{U} \frac{dU}{dy}, \frac{dD}{dy}, \epsilon_t, \frac{k_r}{D}, \frac{I_{ils}}{D}, Sp \right\} \quad (2)$$

where  $Re_{sl}$  is the Reynolds number beyond which the transition eddies in the free shear layers disappear ( $Re_{sl} \cong 2 \times 10^4$  for steady flow), and  $Re_{cr}$  is the critical Reynolds number beyond which the Strouhal number of the *vibrating* cylinder exhibits a smooth *transition* to a higher value (about 0.24), unlike its steady-flow counterpart. The material damping  $\zeta$  is composed of grain friction, dislocation friction (rather small), and the presence of vacancies (microscopic voids). When a material is deformed, say by a VIV event, the structure moves against itself, causing the above phenomena (one or more depending on the structure of the material) to consume some of the energy of the motion. Thus, damping. Clearly, there are no materials or structures without some damping and ‘the undamped natural frequency’ does not exist.

The shear parameter  $(D/U)(dU/dy)$  has been suggested by Vandiver (1993) after consideration of several other possibilities. Humphries and Walker (1988) defined the shear parameter in terms of a characteristic velocity  $U_r$  (often as the mid-span velocity) as  $(D/U_r)(dU/dy)$ . It is not unique and does not define all the dynamics of shear, as noted by Vandiver. However, the use of a larger number of shear parameters is not practicable. The current objective is to use as few parameters as possible, experimental data obtained from rigid cylinders, and strip theory in conjunction with approximate correlation-length models, as suggested by Triantafyllou, Techet, Hover, and Yue (2003). Clearly, when the shear parameter is small (say, less than 0.01), one would expect longer correlation lengths and cells. Additional parameters such as the number of excited modes, wave characteristics, cable properties, axial-end conditions (i.e., free or constrained to move in the axial direction as the test pipe flexes) may have to be considered but are not included in Eq.

(2). This is primarily because of the fact that there are no programmable means to quantify some of them (or their interaction with other parameters) at any Reynolds number. The most important facts about the shear are:

(a) it does not need to create fear as far as safety is concerned (assuming no complications due to proximity effects to free-surface, bottom- and/or other pipe lines, stratification, and the strong non-linearity of the shear);

(b) it reduces and broadens the peak amplitude at all Reynolds numbers (from subcritical to supercritical); and

(c) at high shear parameters (e.g., 0.03), the vortex excitation range usually extends over a larger reduced-velocity range, but at reduced peak amplitudes (Humphries and Walker, 1988).

These will be discussed later in connection with VTV at high Reynolds numbers. The ratio of the longitudinal integral length scale to the diameter,  $I_{ils}/D$  gives a good insight into the effect of turbulence. As shown by Basu (1985), the larger the  $I_{ils}/D$ , the smaller is the interaction between the free-stream turbulence and the cylinder boundary layer and wake. As will be noted later, the intensity of turbulence of the ambient flow plays an important role (within reason) in establishing the critical and supercritical regimes (with or without the help of distributed roughness) and on the effectiveness (often degradation) of some singular VTV suppression devices at sufficiently large Reynolds numbers (Zdravkovich, 1981).

The parameter  $(D/U_o^2)(dU/dt)$ , with  $U_o$  as a reference ambient velocity (say, prior to the start of the acceleration or deceleration), or in more general terms, the parameter  $(D^n/U^{n+1})(d^n U/dt^n)$ , must be considered in assessing the significance of the local acceleration to the convective acceleration. If it is small (Sarpkaya, 1991, 1996a) the flow may be approximated by a juxtaposition of steady states, i.e., by **flows** with negligible or no history effects. If large, it is not sufficient to define the changes in flow velocity with more or less arbitrary or qualitative measures such as 'increasing velocity,' 'progressive change of velocity,' 'velocity with large steps,' or 'decreasing velocity.' **It is a well-known fact that, depending on its magnitude, the rate of change of velocity (plus or minus), as defined by the subject parameters, gives**

rise to very interesting response characteristics, even for an isolated cylinder or cable (see, e.g., Sumer and Fredsoe, 1988; Brika and Laneville, 1993; and Frédéric and Laneville, 2002). Thus,  $(DU_0^2)(dU/dt)$  must be quantified during both the acceleration and deceleration periods to assess the effect of the rate of change of velocity on the inception of the transient states (e.g., hysteresis, intermittent jumps) in both numerical and physical VIV experiments. (Sarpkaya, 1991) has shown that the rate of deceleration at the end of the acceleration period is just as important as the acceleration period. Obviously, it is not only the rate of change of velocity that can precipitate hysteresis effects. The rate of change of amplitude and the rate of change of frequency can produce equally interesting forms of hysteresis and can help to explain some puzzling observations. Thus, it is necessary to consider and quantify the following additional parameters in assessing the history effects:  $(I/U)(\partial A/\partial t)$  and  $(D/U)^2(\partial f_{ex}/\partial t)$ . Such studies will help to resolve the consequences of a specific unsteady input of given type and duration on the subsequent stages of the fluid/structure interaction.

All but the last parameter in Eq. (2) can be controlled (some directly, some indirectly) if one were to dedicate the time and equipment necessary to uniquely qualify the investigation. However, the Schewe parameters  $Sp$  encompass all the circumstances (influencing parameters) mostly beyond the capacity of the experimenter to control or to vary systematically. They are unknowable facility-related constraints or a consequence of *unsteady facility-interference coupling*. Some of these are the end conditions, parameters controlling the mobility of the separation points on curved surfaces, three-dimensional behavior of flow over two-dimensional bodies, unpredictable (or difficult to predict/control) spanwise correlation and its possible dependence on the forced or free nature of the vibrations, consequences of restraining the in-line oscillations, the strong facility-and-amplitude dependence of the lift coefficient, spectral bandwidth of lift force, shedding frequency bandwidth, non-quantifiable growth of the various disturbances in the unsteady shear layers, effects on VIV of the distribution of the ambient velocity and turbulence across the test section, blockage ratio, size and shape of the end plates, non-uniformity of the surface roughness, yaw, body deformation, unwanted secondary vibrations of the **body** and its support system, noise, temperature gradients, and other parameters influencing a given experimental setup. Often a number of small (presumed



innocuous) assumptions in analysis and experiments or both may make the interpretation of the results rather difficult. However, we must also heed Stokes' (1851) words of wisdom: "Such extreme precision in unimportant matters tends, I think, only to perplex the investigator, and prevent him from entering so readily into the spirit of an investigation." Obviously, all the dimensionless parameters cannot replace the physical insight that springs from experience and knowledge.

Returning to the discussion of  $m^* [= \rho_m/\rho_f]$  and  $\zeta$  versus  $m^*\zeta$ ,  $[= \zeta \rho_m/\rho_f]$ , it is noted that there is no compelling reason to combine  $m^*$  with  $\zeta$ . In fact, Sarpkaya (1978, 1979, 1995, and 1996a) and Zdravkovich (1990) suggested over the years that they should not be combined to form a new parameter (or to eliminate an independent parameter). Nevertheless, it has almost become a common practice, at least until recent experiments with small  $m^*$  (large  $\rho_f$  and small  $\rho_m$ ) to combine the two parameters into a so-called 'mass-damping' parameter  $m^*\zeta$ , (with  $\delta = 2\pi\zeta$ ). This will be discussed in more detail later in connection with the consequences of free- or self-excited oscillations where the structural-damping-dependent response may not necessarily be a sinusoidal or stationary random process. Suffice it to note that  $m^*$ , as well as  $\zeta$  play very important roles in VIV. According to KW (1999), the range of synchronization is controlled primarily by  $m^*$  (when  $m^*\zeta$  is constant), whereas the peak amplitudes are controlled principally by the product of  $m^*\zeta$  in the range of Reynolds numbers ( $3.5 \times 10^3$ - $10^4$ ) encountered in their experiments. However, The dependence of  $A/D$  on  $\rho_m$ ,  $\rho_f$ ,  $\zeta$ ,  $f_{vac}$ , and  $Re$  remains to be resolved.

The parameter  $(D/U)(k/m)^{1/2}$ , or its inverse, may be written as  $V_r = U/f_{vac}D$  using the 'natural frequency'  $f_{vac}$  obtained in a vacuum because it is the **only natural** frequency. All other frequencies represent unsolved or partially solved fluid/structure interaction problems of the type pioneered by Stokes (1851) and Basset (1888). Nevertheless, a number of other reduced velocities have been used in the literature for a variety of reasons, including the need to emphasize the importance of the variation of one or the other parameter (added mass, phase, in-phase and out-of phase components of the lift force):  $V_r = U/f_{air}D$ , using  $f_{air}$ , obtained from pluck tests in **still** air, or  $V_r = U/f_{wtr}D$ , using  $f_{wtr}$  obtained from pluck tests in **still** test fluid (e.g., water), or  $V_r = U/f_{com}D$ , **using the actual (or common) frequency  $f_{com}$  at which the lock-in occurs at a given velocity.** Here a clear distinction must be made between the forced

and self-excited oscillations. In forced oscillations,  $f_{com} = f_{ex} = 1/T$  (where  $T$  is the period of oscillation), and it was used by Sarpkaya (1978) to define  $V_r = UT/D$  against which the force-transfer coefficients were plotted. Thus,  $f_{com}$  or  $f_{ex}$  vary as the period of oscillation is varied. Furthermore, one is at liberty to change the frequency and/or the amplitude content of the oscillations.

In 1995, Sarpkaya denoted  $f_{com}$  by  $f_{ny}$  (prevailing frequency) to include the self-excited oscillations. Moe and Wu (1990), working with self-excited as well as forced oscillations, introduced  $f_{true}$ , the frequency “at which the cylinder is actually vibrating.” Here it is denoted by  $f_{com}$  to cover both the forced and self-excited oscillations. It does not remain constant throughout the synchronization range because the added mass coefficient  $C_a$  in viscous flow is not only a function of the shape, orientation, and the physical surroundings of the body, but is also a strong function of the resulting viscous fluid motion. In fact,  $f_{com}$  (either from experiments or from DNS) can be used together with  $f_{vac}$  to determine *aposteriori* the actual added mass,

$$\Delta m = m[(f_{vac}/f_{ex})^2 - 1] \quad (3a)$$

or the added mass coefficient

$$C_a = m^*[(f_{vac}/f_{ex})^2 - 1] \quad (3b)$$

Clearly, the cycle averaged value of  $\Delta m$  is zero for  $f_{com} = f_{vac}$ , and  $\Delta m$  (and  $C_a$ ) are negative whenever  $f_{com} > f_{vac}$ , *regardless of the viscous medium in which the synchronization occurs at the common frequency  $f_{com}$* . For experiments conducted in a dense fluid (say, water), the contribution of the air to the added mass may be neglected, i.e.,  $f_{air} \approx f_{vac}$ . Then one has, for the added water mass,  $\Delta m_{wtr} \approx m[(f_{vac}/f_{com})^2 - 1]$ . In any case,  $C_a$  for a circular cylinder oscillating in water is not equal to its ideal value of unity. Rewriting the above expression as

$$C_a/m^* = \Delta m / m = (f_{vac}/f_{ex})^2 - 1 \quad (3c)$$

it is seen that for a given  $m^*$ ,  $C_a$  is strongly dependent on the accuracy of  $f_{vac}/f_{com}$ . Also, re-writing the normalized total mass or ‘virtual mass’ as

$$(1 + C_a/m^*) = (1 + C_a\rho_f/\rho_m) = (f_{vac}/f_{ex})^2 \quad (3d)$$

and noting that  $C_a$  may have negative as well as large positive values for a circular cylinder (see, e.g., Sarpkaya, 1977b, 1978; Gopalkrishnan, 1993; Vikestad et al., 2000), one observes that the role of the added mass at high mass ratios is minimal or that  $f_{com}$  approaches  $f_{vac}$ . However, for small mass ratios,  $C_a$  becomes increasingly important as the mass ratio  $m^*$  becomes smaller, i.e., for a large (positive)  $C_a$  and small  $m^*$ , the *virtual mass* (added mass plus  $m$ ) may acquire very large values. More importantly, however, for a relatively large *negative*  $C_a$  (say, -0.7) and small  $m^*$  (for example, 0.6), the *virtual mass becomes negative*, a result that is unacceptable. Thus, one must have  $C_a/m^* > -1$  or  $(m^* + C_a) > 0$ . It is clear that bodies of very small  $m^*$  will have rather large in-vacuum natural frequencies ( $f_{vac}$ ). Thus, under the circumstances in which  $C_a$  has a large negative value and the out-of phase component of the lift force is positive (energy transfer from the fluid to the body), the system can develop rather large amplitudes. It must be emphasized that the positive as well as the negative values of the added mass strongly depend on  $A/D$ , as first shown by Sarpkaya (1977b, 1978), and, to a lesser extent, on the Reynolds number, provided that the Reynolds number is larger than about  $1.5 \times 10^4$  to  $2 \times 10^4$ .

Equation (3d) may also be written as,

$$\frac{m^*}{m^* + C_a} = \frac{(f_{com}/f_{st})^2}{(f_{vac}/f_{st})^2} \quad (3e)$$

which emphasizes the role of  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$  and  $f_{vac}/f_{st}$  in determining the ratio of the normalized mass of the oscillating body to its virtual mass. Only when  $C_a = 0$  that one has  $f_{ex} = f_{vac}$ . For all values of  $C_a < 0$ ,  $f_{ex} > f_{vac}$ , and, conversely, for all values of  $C_a > 0$ ,  $f_{ex} < f_{vac}$ . Forced vibration experiments show that  $C_a$  for  $A/D = 0.5$ , for example, goes through zero at  $f_{ex}/f_{st} \approx 0.85$  (for  $A/D = 0.5$ , for example) and abrupt changes occur in phase and the energy transferred to the cylinder from the fluid as  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$  decreases, say from,  $f_{ex}/f_{st} \approx 0.88$  to  $f_{ex}/f_{st} \approx 0.80$ . For cylinders with relatively large  $m^*$ ,  $f_{ex}/f_{vac}$  remains close to unity, the shedding mode changes from a Karman-type of vortex shedding (two single vortices per cycle) to two pairs of vortices per

cycle (to be discussed in more detail later). However, for cylinders with small  $m^*$ , the mode of vortex shedding remains essentially the same but the change is accompanied with some intermittency. The importance of these interesting phenomena, leading to a strong connection between the forces, masses, VIV suppression, and mode and phase changes will become apparent later.

As to the role of the damping factor, it is rather unfortunate that no systematic experiments have been reported in vacuum to determine  $\zeta$ . During the second half of the past century, the word 'damping' has been used at various times to mean 'damping in vacuum', 'damping in still air', 'damping in still water', and 'damping in flowing test fluid'. Furthermore, some experiments were reported without the damping factor and they were subsequently obtained from tests on pipe or cable samples by Griffin, et al. (1976). To the best of our knowledge, only Koopmann (1967a; **also** reported in Griffin et al., 1976) conducted limited experiments to determine the 'structural to the still-fluid damping' of an elastically-supported 6-mm cylinder by oscillating it in both air and vacuum. He found that the actual structural contribution was only **15** percent of the still-air damping. Based on this experiment, Griffin et al. (1976) concluded that "the decay of the system in still air was predominantly due **to fluid resistance**, and the common assumption of negligible 'in-air fluid loading' was not valid." The consequences of this conclusion are: (a) it is difficult to compare amplitude data from various sources because of the potential variations in the relative contributions of fluid and structural damping to **still fluid damping**  $\zeta_f$  used in the so-called mass-damping parameter  $m\zeta_f/\rho D^2$ ; and (b) at relatively small mass-damping ratios, the comparison of the data obtained in air and water is further complicated. It is often assumed that one could calculate the mass-damping either with the damping in air or water. This is not quite accurate because the actual structural contribution may only be a small fraction of the still-air damping whereas the ratio of the same structural-plus-air damping to that brought about by the out-of-phase component of the transverse force in water is negligible. In any case, 'damping in still water,' like 'added mass in still water', is only another manifestation of an unsolved fluid-interaction problem (i.e., the VIV itself), and it is not an independently controllable parameter (for further discussion, see Batchelor, 1967, p. 357, and Blevins, **1990**). However, for VIVs in water, the structural damping term in the equation of motion may be negligibly small relative to the out-of-phase

component of the transverse fluid force. It may even be assumed zero in numerical simulations of VIV in dense fluids.

The concern regarding the reliability of the much-reproduced graph showing the maximum  $A/D$  versus the so-called response parameter  $S_G (= 2\pi^3 St^2 \zeta \rho_m / \rho_f)$ , (see, e.g., Sarpkaya, 1978) provided us with a strong impetus to carry out a series of experiments with circular rods and tubes in air and in the vacuum chamber of an existing electron microscope. The ends of the cantilevered (smooth and roughened) rods were rounded and the free ends of the cantilevered tubes were fitted with semi-spherical caps. The supporting ends were imbedded in a solid wall (a small hole allowed the complete vacuuming of the inside of the tubes). The oscillating mass of each test element was varied by changing  $L$ . The mass was varied from 0.0015 slugs/ft to 0.015 slugs/ft. The results have conclusively shown that the ratio of the actual structural contribution to the still-air damping varied from 0.990 to 0.995, depending on the frequency of vibration and the shape of the cantilevers. For any one test tube, the frequencies of vibration in air and in vacuum were identical. It is on the basis of this conclusion that we have replotted the data compiled by Griffin, Skop, and Ramberg (1976) and subsequently by Skop and Balasubramanian (1997) in Fig. 7(a) using a linear axis for  $A/D$ . Several attempts were made in the past (Sarpkaya, 1979; Griffin and Ramberg, 1982; and Skop and Balasubramanian, 1997) to devise semi-empirical relationships or least-square fits to the data shown in Fig. 7(a). The shortcomings of the previous  $A/D$  versus  $S_G$  relationships were that they were mostly curve-fits (except the one proposed by Sarpkaya, 1979) and none was able to represent the data satisfactorily at higher  $S_G$  values. We have devised (in spite of our long-standing dislike for curve-fits) a new and relatively simple curve-fit given by,

$$\left(\frac{A}{D}\right) \frac{1}{\gamma} = 1.12 e^{-1.05 S_G} \quad (4)$$

which may also be written as  $(A/D)/\gamma = 1.12 0.65^{S_G}$  which conveys the unrigorous but plausible suggestion that  $\ln(A/D/\gamma)$  may be, to a first order of approximation, a linear function of  $S_G$ . The dimensionless mode factor  $\gamma$  is 1.0 for a rigid cylinder, 1.291 for a uniform pivoted rod, 1.155 for a taut string or cable, and




Fig. 7 Experimental measurements of the modally normalized maximum amplitude versus the response parameter  $S_G$  and the proposed curve-fit (Eq. (4)). The data is tabulated in Skop & Balasubramanian (1997): ●, water, ○, air. The above figures show: (a) a Log-Log plot; (b) a linear-Log plot, (c) a Log-linear plot, and (d) a linear-linear plot. In each case Eq. (4) represents the data reasonably well and makes an unrigorous but plausible suggestion that  $\ln(A/D)/\gamma$  may be a linear function of  $S_G$ .

1.305 for a cantilevered uniform beam. These and other mode factors are tabulated in Blevins (1990). Figures 7(b) (d) show the Linear-Log, Log Log, and Log-Linear plots of  $(A/D)/\gamma$  versus  $S_G$  and the corresponding curve-fits using the above equation. The scatter in the data, particularly for  $S_G$  less than about 0.5 (i.e., mostly for the experiments

in water), is of practical as well as research interest and is not entirely due to experimental errors. It is partly due to the use of relatively small Reynolds numbers (less than  $10^4$ ) for which the transition to turbulence on the free shear layers does not move sufficiently upstream, magnification of the uncertainties in the damping factors, the end conditions (i.e., the restraint applied to the ends of the cables for or against *axial* motion), the history of the motion (e.g., whether a particular steady flow velocity has been arrived at from a lower or higher value, Brika and Laneville, 1993), and, most importantly, the particular behavior of the wake and the lift coefficient  $C_L$ .

## 6. Linearized equations of the self-excited motion and their limitations

The equation of motion for a body of single-degree of freedom with linear springs and damping has been known for a long time and constitutes one of the classic examples in most vibration texts. Briefly, it may be written as

$$m\ddot{y} + c\dot{y} + ky = C_y \rho D L U^2 \quad (5a)$$

in which  $m$  is the mass of the cylinder,  $c$  the linear material damping,  $k$  the linear spring constant,  $\rho_f$  the density of fluid,  $D$  and  $L$  are the diameter and length of the cylinder,  $U$  is the 'steady' ambient velocity, and  $C_y$  is the strongly-amplitude-dependent lift coefficient. The amplitude of the exciting force, denoted by  $C_L$ , and the phase angle  $\phi$  (between the total force and the displacement) embody the essence of all that is needed for the *dynamics* of VIV. Equation (5a) may be reduced to

$$\ddot{y}_r + 2\zeta\dot{y}_r + y_r = (S_G / \zeta)(f_{com} / f_{vac})^2 C_y \quad (5b)$$

This is a non-linear equation because of the strong dependence of  $C_y$  on the amplitude of the cylinder displacement. However, at lock-in the displacement  $y$  and the transverse fluid-force coefficient  $C_y$  are usually expressed, to an unknown order of approximation, by sinusoidal functions (known as the harmonic model approximation) in which the force leads the displacement (the horse leads the cart) by a phase angle  $\phi$

$$y_r = (A / D) \sin 2\pi f_{com} t \quad (6)$$

$$C_y = C_L \sin(2\pi f_{com} t + \varphi) \quad (7a)$$

or

$$C_y = (C_L \cos \varphi) \sin(2\pi f_{com} t) + (C_L \sin \varphi) \cos(2\pi f_{com} t) \quad (7b)$$

Clearly, the displacement and acceleration are zero at  $y = 0$  (the mean position) and the absolute values of the displacement and acceleration are maximum at  $y = A$ . The cylinder decelerates as it moves toward larger  $|y|$  and accelerates as it moves towards smaller  $|y|$  values. It is a well-known fact that in *steady flow* the angle that the shear layer separates from a cylinder is affected by the Reynolds number. A shear layer on a body undergoing VIV is expected to be strongly affected by whether the relative flow past the cylinder is accelerating or decelerating. Thus, the variations of the total relative velocity about the cylinder and the alternating nature of the accelerations and decelerations of the cylinder could lead to highly complex excursions of the separation points and shear layer transitions. Krishnamoorthy et al. (2001) observed that “both shear layers develop abrupt double roll-ups as the cylinder accelerates from the top-dead-center to its mean position.”

The substitution of Eqs. (6) and (7) into Eq. (5b) yields the following well-known expressions for the frequency and amplitude in terms of  $\rho_m/\rho_f$  rather than  $m^*$

$$\frac{f_{com}}{f_{vac}} = \left[ 1 - \frac{C_L}{2\pi^3} \frac{D}{A} \frac{\rho_f}{\rho_m} \left( \frac{U}{f_{vac} D} \right)^2 \cos \varphi \right]^{1/2} \quad (8)$$

and

$$\frac{A}{D} = \frac{1}{2} C_L \sin \varphi \frac{St^2}{S_G} \left( \frac{U}{f_{vac} D} \right)^2 \frac{f_{vac}}{f_{com}} \quad (9a)$$

or

$$\frac{A}{D} = \frac{1}{2} C_L \sin \varphi \frac{1}{2\pi^3 \zeta} \frac{\rho_f}{\rho_m} \left( 1 + C_a \frac{\rho_f}{\rho_m} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{U}{f_{vac} D} \right)^2 \quad (9b)$$



Thus, the linear equations of motion show that  $A/D$  is dependent on  $C_L$ , the phase angle  $\varphi$ ,  $\zeta$ ,  $\rho_f/\rho_m$ ,  $(U/f_{vac}D)$ , and  $(1 + C_a \rho_f/\rho_m)^{1/2}$  or  $f_{vac}/f_{com}$ . There is no mathematically derivable direct dependence on such parameter combinations as  $(m^* + C_A)\zeta$ , where  $C_A$  is the potential flow added mass coefficient ( $C_A = 1.0$  for a circular cylinder), or on yet another parameter  $f^* = [(m^* + C_A)/(m^* + C_{EA})]^{1/2}$  where “ $C_{EA}$  is an ‘effective’ added-mass coefficient that includes an apparent effect due to the total transverse fluid force in phase with the body acceleration,” introduced by KW (1999), (in our notation,  $C_{EA} = C_a$ ). Furthermore, numerical solutions of the ‘exact’ equations of motion do not need, do not depend on, and do not give rise to such arbitrary parameters as  $f^* = [(m^* + C_A)/(m^* + C_{EA})]^{1/2}$ .

Equating  $A/D$  from Eqs. (9a) and (9b), one has the tangent of the phase angle

$$\tan\varphi = \frac{2\zeta f_{vac} f_{com}}{f_{vac}^2 - f_{com}^2} \quad (10)$$

Recalling that  $C_a = m^*[(f_{vac}/f_{com})^2 - 1]$ , one has for  $f_{com} < f_{vac}$ , i.e., for a positive added mass,  $\tan\varphi > 0$  and for  $f_{com} > f_{vac}$ , i.e., for a negative added mass,  $\tan\varphi < 0$ . Thus, at  $f_{com} = f_{vac}$ , the phase angle shifts by 180 degrees. Conversely, a 180-degree phase shift corresponds to a change in the sign of the added mass from positive to negative or vice versa, depending on the direction of the change of  $f_{com}$ . It must be emphasized that any change in  $C_a$ , and thus in phase is not sudden. The reorganization of the wake occurs over a finite frequency range.

The foregoing analysis shows that  $A/D$  is a function of  $C_L$  (see Fig. 5b),  $C_a$  depends on  $A/D$  and  $U/f_{vac}D$ ,  $f_{com}/f_{vac}$  varies with  $U/f_{vac}D$ , and  $\varphi$  depends on  $\zeta$  and  $f_{com}/f_{vac}$ , and they all depend on the Reynolds number. Nevertheless, one can reasonably conclude by inserting once  $\rho_f = \rho_{air}$  and then  $\rho_f = \rho_{wtr}$  in Eqs. (8) and (9b) that:

(a)  $(f_{com}/f_{vac})_{air}$  approaches unity because the second term in the bracket in Eq. (8) becomes negligibly small and  $A/D$  in Eq. (9a) may be simplified to

$$\frac{A}{D} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{St^2}{S_G} \left( \frac{U}{f_{vac}D} \right)^2 C_L \sin\varphi \quad (11)$$

(b)  $(f_{com}/f_{vac})_{wtr}$  becomes very small because the said second term becomes of order unity;

(c)  $(A/\gamma D)_{wtr}$  becomes larger than  $(A/\gamma D)_{air}$  with decreasing  $S_G$  [see Fig. 7 and Eqs. (4) and (9b)];

(d) The suppression of  $(A/\gamma D)_{wtr}$  is more difficult compared to  $(A/\gamma D)_{air}$  partly because of the much larger  $\rho_f$  (for water) leading to a much smaller  $S_G (= 2\pi^3 St^2 \zeta \rho_m / \rho_f)$ , particularly for small mean mass densities, **and** partly because of a number of other issues such as the variation of  $C_L$ , the width of the lock-in range, and the coherence length with  $A/D$ , discussed in connection with Figs. (5a) and (5b). Thus, one needs suppression devices which could successfully reduce  $C_L$  in water **for** amplitude ratios *smaller than about* 0.5, without excessive drag penalty. **As** appropriately noted by Bearman and Branković (2002), “it is more difficult to suppress any resulting **VIV** in water compared to air because of the much smaller **m\* $\zeta$** .” Evidently, the entire suppression issue is relatively more complex than that posed by  $S_G$  or **m\* $\zeta$**  alone.

The foregoing analysis is predicated on the assumption that the frequency and the amplitude of the oscillations remain constant, as assumed in Eqs. (6) and (7) for the displacement and force. Oddly enough, this is more so for the ‘forced’ oscillations than for the free oscillations. **As** noted by Schewe (1983), in connection with stationary cylinders in steady flow, “The time functions of the lift, drag and amplitude look like sine functions, which are randomly modulated in amplitude and frequency. The instantaneous total force acting on the cylinder is then the result of the more or less cooperative behavior of these individual subsystems, which differ slightly from each other in frequency and amplitude.” Cylinders undergoing VIV exhibit similar non-stationary, non-ergodic, randomly-modulated amplitudes. **As** noted by Moe et al. (1994), nearly harmonic oscillations occur for self-excited vibrations in the lock-in region. The displacement spectra have narrow bandwidths, yet 10% variation in peak amplitudes is common and the associated force amplitudes are strongly irregular. Therefore, the average lift force for the self-excited case cannot be assumed equal to the lift force for the forced-vibration case, even though the average motion amplitudes for both cases may be equal. The assumption that the displacement and

force must depend respectively only on  $\sin\omega t$  and  $\sin(\omega t + \varphi)$  renders the problem more manageable but conveniently avoids the issue as far as the nature of the random fluctuations of lift, drag, and amplitude are concerned. In fact, it might be said that the analysis of free oscillations on the basis of a single frequency as in Eqs. (5b), (6), and (7), without the inclusion of higher order harmonics, may be unwarranted.

## 7. Unsteady force-decomposition

The lift coefficient in Eqs. (5a) or (7a) or its in-phase component with the cylinder velocity must be determined analytically, numerically or experimentally if any progress is to be made toward solving industrially significant VIV problems. It is much easier and more reliable to quantify the lift coefficient using forced vibrations because of the constancy of the desired amplitude and frequency. Sarpkaya (1978), using  $y = -A \sin \omega_{com} t$  and  $U(t) = -U_m \cos \omega_{com} t$ , expressed  $C_L$  as

$$C_L = C_{mh} \sin \omega_{com} t - C_{dh} \cos \omega_{com} t \quad (12a)$$

where  $\omega_{com} = 2\pi f_{com}$  and the coefficients  $C_{mh}$  and  $C_{dh}$  are the Fourier averages, over many cycles of oscillation (about 100), of the transverse component of the normalized force acting on the cylinder. They are assumed to depend on  $A/D$  and the Reynolds number. Equation (12a) may also be written as

$$C_L = -C_a \sin \omega_{com} t + C_d \cos \omega_{com} t \quad (12b)$$

using,  $y_r = (A/D) \sin 2\pi f_{com} t$  as in Eq. (6) and  $U(t)/U_m = \cos \omega_{com} t$ . Here,  $C_a$  is the added mass coefficient and  $C_d$  is the drag coefficient. If the body were at rest and the fluid oscillated about it,  $C_a$  needs to be replaced by  $1 + C_a$  to account for the effect of the imposed pressure gradient. The genesis of the above equations is the so-called "Morison-O'Brien-Johnson-Schaaf" equation or the "MOJS" equation (1950), according to which the time-dependent force exerted on a body moving with the velocity  $U(t)$  in a fluid otherwise at rest is assumed to be a linear sum of an acceleration-dependent inertial force and a velocity-square-dependent drag force, i.e.,

$$F(t) = \frac{1}{2} \rho C_d D |U| U + \rho C_a \frac{\pi D^2}{4} \frac{dU}{dt} \quad (13)$$

The coefficients of the two forces are determined experimentally by measuring the force and calculating their Fourier or least-squared averages (Sarpkaya, 1976a,b; 1977a, 1986a, b; 1987). More intricate formulations of the time-dependent force at the price of complexity turned out to be arguably not beneficial (Sarpkaya, 1981, 1985, 2000, 2001).

For a cylinder oscillating sinusoidally with  $U = U_m \sin \omega_{com} t$ , the first term on the right-hand side of the above equation has often been **Zinearized** (provided the circumstances be such that the non-linearity of the square of the velocity may be neglected) to yield Eq. (12b) (Sarpkaya 1978). Re-writing Eq. (7b)

$$C_s = (C_L \cos \varphi) \sin(2\pi f_{com} t) + (C_L \sin \varphi) \cos(2\pi f_{com} t) \quad (7b-R)$$

and comparing it with Eq. (12b), one has

$$C_a = -C_L \cos \varphi \quad \text{and} \quad C_d = C_L \sin \varphi \quad (14)$$

from which one can find  $C_L = (C_a^2 + C_d^2)^{1/2}$  and the phase angle  $\varphi = \tan^{-1}(-C_d/C_a)$ . The maximum of  $C_L$ , from Eq. (12b), occurs at  $\theta_m = \tan^{-1}(-C_d/C_a) = \pi/2 - \varphi$ . In other words, the following holds true for the linear approximation of the sinusoidal VIV regardless of whether it is obtained from the assumptions leading to the sinusoidal displacement and a sinusoidal force with a phase of  $\varphi$  or from a **linearization** of the **MOJS** equation:

$$\varphi = \tan^{-1}\left(-\frac{C_d}{C_a}\right) = \frac{\pi}{2} - \tan^{-1}\left(-\frac{C_a}{C_d}\right) = \frac{\pi}{2} - \theta_m \quad (15)$$

or, combining it with Eq. (10), one has

$$\varphi = \tan^{-1}\left(-\frac{C_d}{C_a}\right) = \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{2\zeta f_{vac} f_{com}}{f_{vac}^2 - f_{com}^2}\right) \quad (16)$$

As far as the forced oscillations are concerned, the linearized version of Eq. (13) is no more or no less empirical than the Eq. (7a). However, for *the self-excited vibrations*, the original non-linearized form of the MOJS equation is certainly more representative of the prevailing state of the flow, particularly at industrially significant Reynolds numbers.

The linearization represents a considerable simplification for both the ocean and the laboratory environment. The transverse as well as the in-line force for more complex oscillations (e.g., beating phenomena, oscillations with irregular or modulated amplitudes) cannot be represented by a two-coefficient model and certainly cannot be analyzed on a cycle-by-cycle basis in search of a new phenomenon. One needs to determine the Fourier averages of the said coefficients, deduced from many cycles (say, 100) to obtain representative results. There will always be considerable uncertainty stemming from the ambient **flow** environment and the Schewe parameters. This, in fact, is one of the fundamental reasons for the difficulty of dealing with fluid/structure interactions in a non-laboratory environment and with self-excited vibrations in both nature and in the laboratory environment.

If the motion contains amplitude– as well as frequency–modulated fluctuations (as in the case of free or self-excited oscillations), one must perform a *complex demodulation analysis* to capture the basic features of the data (see e.g., Bloomfield, 2000). In such cases, the assumption of a mean frequency and/or amplitude may lead to less accurate force components and phase angles. One need not be reminded that the single most important parameter in VIV is  $\varphi$  and its dependence on all the parameters given by **Eq. (2)**. To emphasize the point, we rewrite Eq. (2) as

$$\varphi = F \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \zeta, \frac{\rho_f U D}{\mu_f}, \frac{L}{D}, \frac{4m}{\rho_f \pi L D^2}, \frac{D}{U} \left( \frac{k}{m} \right)^{1/2}, \text{Re}_{sl} \\ \text{Re}_{cr}, \frac{D}{U_o^2} \frac{dU}{dt}, \frac{D}{U} \frac{dU}{dy}, \frac{dD}{dy}, \varepsilon, \frac{k_r}{D}, \frac{I_{ils}}{D}, S_p \end{array} \right\} \quad (17)$$

Clearly,  $\varphi$  is destined to exhibit large scatter, particularly in tests with self-excited oscillations and in numerical simulations employing, for example, LES. **An** orbicular leaf attached to a tree responds with exuberance to droplets of uniform shape, weight, and frequency falling on it from a pipette when the frequency and the phase angle relative to the motion of the leaf are set precisely. When the phase angle is a few degrees off, the leaf comes to a dead stop even if the frequency is kept the same.

Lighthill (1986) asserted that the viscous drag force and the inviscid inertia force acting on a bluff body subjected to unsteady motion in a viscous fluid otherwise at rest operate independently. Accordingly, he expressed the **MOJS** equation, Eq. (13), as

$$F = C_a^* \rho (dU/dt) V_b + \frac{1}{2} \rho A_p U^2 C_d \quad (18)$$

where  $C_a^*$  is the ideal inviscid flow value of the added mass coefficient. It is obvious from the form of the Eq. (18) that Lighthill (1986) meant by “viscous drag force” a force, which contains *no inertial force* due to the motion of vortices. Thus, his second term on the right-hand side of Eq. (18) is only a *velocity-square-dependent drag* force. Sarpkaya (2001) has shown conclusively that the above assertion is invalid. This is rather obvious from the fact that the subtraction of the ideal inertial force from the total force leaves behind *a vortex-motion force* or, just simply, a *vortex force* which necessarily contains both a ‘velocity-square-dependent’ force and an ‘acceleration-dependent’ inertial force. In other words, the remainder of the total force (the second term) cannot be expressed as a velocity-square-dependent force alone (with a simple drag coefficient). Lighthill (1986) stated that “I want to argue that, as we necessarily move to more refined methods of estimation, we can appropriately continue to separate hydrodynamic loadings (as Morison’s equation does) into vortex-flow forces and potential-flow forces ... as Taylor (1928a) did ...” This created the impression that the ‘vortex-flow forces’ and ‘viscous drag forces’ were one and the same: a velocity-square-dependent drag force, devoid of inertial forces. A careful reading of Taylor’s papers (1928a, 1928b) shows that they deal with the use of distributed sources and sinks to calculate the added **mass** of **airfoils** immersed in **an** inviscid fluid and the determination of the effect of *convective*

*acceleration* on bodies immersed in converging or diverging wind/water tunnels (the so-called horizontal buoyancy) in *steady* inviscid flow. They do not deal with unsteady flows, vortex motion, or “separation of hydrodynamic loading into vortex-flow forces and potential-flow forces” contrary to Lighthill’s (1986) assertions. However, we must emphasize that *there is nothing wrong in separating the ideal inertial force from the total force* (as done in the industry for many years) *as long as one recognizes the fact that the remainder of the force is still comprised of both drag and inertial forces*, which require a number of additional terms for their correct representation in a model equation.

Stokes’ 152-year old solution (1851) of oscillating viscous flow about a sphere is given by,

$$F(t) = \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{9}{2}(\pi\beta)^{-1/2} \right) \frac{\rho\pi D^3}{6} \frac{dU}{dt} + \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2}(\pi\beta)^{1/2} \right) (3\pi\mu DU) \quad (19a)$$

Clearly, both the inertial and drag components of the force are modified by the effect of viscosity (so called, Basset’s history terms, 1888) as seen from the following version of the above equation

$$F(t) - \left( \frac{1}{2} \frac{\rho\pi D^3}{6} \frac{dU}{dt} \right) = \frac{9}{2}(\pi\beta)^{-1/2} \frac{\rho\pi D^3}{6} \frac{dU}{dt} + \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2}(\pi\beta)^{1/2} \right) (3\pi\mu DU) \quad (19b)$$

The subtraction, from the total force, of an ‘ideal mass force’ (generated by the displacement of the fluid **as** the body accelerates) leaves on the right-hand side of the equation a  $\beta$ -dependent *in-phase* inertial force and a  $\beta$ -dependent *out-of-phase* drag force. Together these two are the unsteady flow forces (the so-called ‘vortex-forces’ in separated time-dependent flows) (Sarpkaya, 1996a, 2001). The history of the motion (particularly in hysteresis) manifests itself in both the in-phase and the out-of-phase components of the force.

In vortex induced oscillations, the phenomenon is far more complex. However, the extraction of the ideal inertial force from the total force (Govardhan and Williamson, 2000, hereafter referred to as GW) necessarily leads to a net force still

comprised of an acceleration-dependent inertial force and a velocity- or velocity-square-dependent drag force, as in Eqs. (13, 19b).

Let us now reconsider Eq. (7b) in a slightly different form and denote the phase angle between the total force and displacement as  $\varphi_{total}$ , for reasons which will become clear shortly

$$C_L(t) = [C_L \cos \varphi_{total}] \sin(2\pi f_{com} t) + [C_L \sin \varphi_{total}] \cos(2\pi f_{com} t) \quad (20a)$$

and separate the in-phase (inertia) component of the force into two parts: the ideal inertial force  $IF$  (to be quantified later), plus the remainder,

$$[C_{Lvortex} \cos \varphi_{vortex} + IF] \sin(2\pi f_{com} t) \quad (20b)$$

Now, inserting **Eq. (20b)** into **Eq. (20a)**, one has

$$C_L(t) = [C_{Lvortex} \cos \varphi_{vortex} + IF] \sin(2\pi f_{com} t) + [C_L \sin \varphi_{total}] \cos(2\pi f_{com} t) \quad (20c)$$

Obviously, the first term in the first bracket is modified by the addition of the word 'vortex' in the subscripts in order to compensate for the second term so that the total (in phase) inertial force remains unchanged, i.e., *only the forces, that are in phase with each other, can be subtracted from each other*. The out-of-phase component of the force ( $C_L \sin \varphi_{total}$ ) does not change. However, both  $C_L$  and  $\sin \varphi_{total}$  must individually change in order to render the out-of-phase component of  $C_L$  equal to  $C_{Lvortex}$  and  $C_L \sin \varphi_{total} = C_{Lvortex} \sin \varphi_{vortex}$ . This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} [C_L(t) - IF \sin(2\pi f_{com} t)] &= C_{Lvortex} \cos \varphi_{vortex} \sin(2\pi f_{com} t) \\ &+ C_{Lvortex} \sin \varphi_{vortex} \cos(2\pi f_{com} t) \end{aligned} \quad (20d)$$

where the amplitude of the ideal inertial force is given by



$$IF = 2\pi^3 \text{St}^2 \left( \frac{f_{com}^2}{f_{st}^2} \right) \frac{A}{D} \quad (20e)$$

Furthermore, it is seen that  $\tan \phi_{total}$  and  $\tan \phi_{vortex}$  are related by

$$\frac{\tan \phi_{total}}{\tan \phi_{vortex}} = 1 - \frac{IF}{C_a} \quad (20f)$$

which shows that large differences may occur between the two phase angles when strong changes occur in  $C_a$  and/or  $A/D$  due to rapid changes in vortex shedding, hysteresis, or intermittent jumps at some particular values of  $f_{com}/f_{st}$  (e.g., between the lower and upper branches in  $\phi_{total}$  or between the upper and initial branches in  $\phi_{vortex}$ ) for a given  $\text{St}$  **at relatively small Reynolds numbers**. The foregoing is predicated on the assumption that the frequency and amplitude modulations are negligible to allow one to make precise determinations of the subject phase angles. In self-excited oscillations, this is not always the case. These will be discussed in more detail later.

## 8. Limitations of the forced and free vibrations

The motivation of this section is not to assess how the forced oscillations can be used to predict the free VIVs under otherwise similar conditions, but rather to examine in depth their similarities, differences, and limitations. Obviously, the two cases are not identical: one is driven internally by the wake at an **average** frequency  $f$  (dictated by the past and the prevailing state of the motion and the periodic forcing arising from it) as the Reynolds number increases with increasing  $U$  in  $U/f_{wtr}D$  as in KW (1999) and GW (2000). Furthermore, some or all of the Reynolds numbers in the synchronization range may not necessarily be larger than  $\text{Re}_{sl}$ , making the response dependent on both  $\text{Re}$  (i.e., on the state of the shear layers) and  $U/f_{wtr}D$ . Forced oscillations are driven externally at an **exact** frequency  $f_{ex}$  at a desired amplitude  $A/D$  and Reynolds number throughout the range of  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$  or  $V_r = U/f_{ex}D$ . One is limited largely by the lock-in regions and the other to a large range of reduced velocities and amplitudes. Forced oscillations help to regularize and idealize almost **every aspect of the vortex induced oscillations, leading to nearly pure sinusoidal oscillations, forces, and almost repeatable wake states**. Thus, one has an exact

knowledge of the frequency of motion and of the magnitude and shape of the displacement (and hence, of the velocity and acceleration). Even then, however, one expects and finds differences in the structure of the wake from cycle to cycle, for example due to changes in the motion of the separation points and the coherence length.

The bodies undergoing VIV in nature are neither constrained (except by their supports) nor forced to oscillate at a constant amplitude and frequency. Their reduced amplitude ( $A/D$ ) and Reynolds number vary with the reduced velocity and the accurate determination of their individual effects on the remaining governing parameters in general and on the lock-in phenomenon in particular becomes difficult particularly when some or all  $Re$  values are below  $Re_{sl}$ . The extraction and interpretation of reliable force information from free oscillations are more difficult. This is particularly true when the body responds very rapidly to changes in reduced velocity as in Feng's (1968) or in Brika and Laneville's experiments (1993) in certain ranges of their reduced velocity  $V_{r,b} = (V_r/2\pi) = U/2\pi f_{ex}D$ . Thus, neither the instantaneous center of gravity nor the cycle-averaged value of the virtual mass, nor the force acting on the body, nor the acceleration of the body is known, except for the fact that the virtual mass, the force, and the acceleration are nonlinearly related. This is analogous to deducing information from  $F = (\text{virtual mass}) \times \text{acceleration}$  without knowing *any one of the three elements of the most fundamental equation of motion*. In spite of this, it should be the ultimate objective of the VIV research to predict, to the extent possible, the kinematics and dynamics of self excited vibrations from forced vibration (physical/numerical) experiments and, equally important, the dynamics of forced oscillations (say, e.g., drag, lift, and inertia coefficients and the phase angle) from the physical/numerical experiments with self-excited oscillations. However, perfect synchronization is not 'perfect' and 10% variation in peak amplitudes of force (in both forced and self-excited oscillations) is quite common, as shown in Fig. 8 (Moe and Wu, 1990). Griffin (1972) carried out both self-excited and sinusoidally forced oscillations under nearly similar conditions. At the same average amplitude, the free oscillations exhibited amplitude (and, most certainly, phase) modulations, similar to those noted above. The average velocities in the wake were quite similar, but their instantaneous values exhibited the expected discrepancies. The numerical simulations of Al-Jemal and Dalton (2002,2003) and




Fig. 8 (above). Sample data show that perfect synchronization is not 'perfect' and 10% variation in peak amplitudes of force (in both forced and self-excited oscillations) is quite common; (a) Self-excited, in-line spring-supported,  $V_r = 5.93$ ; (b) Forced, in-line spring-supported,  $V_r = 5.93$ . (Moe and Wu, 1990).

Fig. 9 (right). Example showing that the computed lift (after sufficient transition time) exhibits "quite large variability," (all for  $m^* = 7.85$ ,  $f_{vac} = 0.14$ ); (a) Damping  $\zeta = 0.0$ ; (b)  $\zeta = 0.02$ ; (c)  $\zeta = 0.10$ . (Al-Jamal and Dalton, 2002).

Blackburn et al. (2000), among many others, have shown that the computed lift (after sufficient transition time) exhibits 'quite large variability' as in Fig. 9, and the wave form exhibits interesting 'double peaks' as in Fig. 10, "likely to be related to the shedding of four concentrated regions of vorticity per motion cycle," as noted by Blackburn et al. (2001).




Fig. 10. Time-series of lift, its instantaneous magnitude and phase angle in relation to cross-flow displacement for the three-dimensional simulations ( $Re = 1250$ ,  $St.V_r = 1.33$ ) (Blackburn, Govardhan, Williamson, 2001).

The immediate ramifications of the facts noted above are that (a) the response amplitude given by Eqs. (9a or 9b) becomes increasingly more approximate as the amplitude and phase modulations increase; (b) the second order fluctuations affect the frequency ratio [(Eq. (8))] and the amplitude [Eq. (9a)] differently, and (c) the appearance of  $m^*$  and  $\zeta$  as  $m^*\zeta$  in Eq. (9a) does not mean that  $m^*\zeta$  is a universal parameter of  $\mathbf{W}$  for all ranges of  $m^*$  and  $\zeta$  for a number of reasons. The parameter  $m^*\zeta$  is based on a set of linear equations whereas the oscillations are affected by the start-up effects, history effects, and transitional second-order changes, separation excursions, correlation length fluctuations, pressure distribution, to name just a few of the governing and influencing parameters. The imposed amplitude and frequency drive the forced oscillations whereas the free oscillations are driven by the past and the prevailing state of the motion and the forces arising from it. This is particularly significant when transient phenomena take place at certain frequencies in both the idealized experiments (at low Reynolds numbers) and in practical applications (pipes and cables) at larger Reynolds numbers undergoing both in-line and transverse vibrations.

The relative amplitude of the *forced sinusoidal* oscillations can be accurately represented by

$$y_r = (A / D) \sin 2\pi f_{ex} t \quad (6-R)$$

where  $f_{ex}$  is the driving frequency, However, the representation of the fluid-force coefficient  $C_y$  by a linearized equation, such as

$$C_y = (C_L \cos \phi) \sin(2\pi f_{ex} t) + (C_L \sin \phi) \cos(2\pi f_{ex} t) \quad (7b-R)$$

may be valid only for small MD values for the following reasons. The so-called Keulegan-Carpenter number  $K = 2\pi A/D$  for a cylinder subjected to oscillations transverse to a uniform stream varies in the approximate range of  $1.25 < K < 10$ . Extensive investigations of sinusoidal flow about a cylinder (Sarpkaya, 1976a, 1977a, b; 1986a, b) have shown that the drag and inertia coefficients in the MOJS equation vary with both Re and K. In the range of K values noted above, the variation of the added mass coefficient is particularly strong for K larger than about 7. This is primarily due to the changes in the structure of the wake on both sides of the cylinder. In the case of a circular cylinder subjected to transverse oscillations there are additional complications and major differences: the direction of the ambient flow relative to the cylinder changes with time, the oscillations are in the cross-flow direction but the ambient flow is normal to it and the wakes of the two cases are not even similar. However, one can easily surmise that both the added mass and velocity-square-dependent lift force are even more complex than that for the pure sinusoidal oscillations in a fluid otherwise at rest. This has already been shown by Sarpkaya (1978) in his forced oscillation experiments. The larger the amplitude of VIV oscillations, *the more nonlinear is the dependence of the lift and inertial forces on A/D, particularly at mode changes, phase jumps, hysteresis, and intermitting switching*. In other words, Eqs. (6) and (7b) must be replaced by a nonlinear force equation to enhance its accuracy if it is to be compared with self-excited vibrations. The only such equation (other than the addition of higher order terms with either arbitrary or Fourier-averaged coefficients) is Morison's equation. It is easy to show that it reduces to (Keulegan and Carpenter, 1938; Sarpkaya, 1977a)

$$C_y = C_d \frac{3n}{8} |\cos \omega t| \cos \omega t - C_a \sin \omega t \quad (13-R)$$

The maximum force occurs at  $\omega t = \theta_m$  where

$$\theta_m = \sin^{-1} \left( \frac{-4 C_a}{3n C_d} \right) \quad (21)$$

It is interesting to note that  $|C_d/C_a|$  must be larger than  $4/3\pi$ . Using Eq. (21) one can determine the phase angle with respect to displacement, velocity, or acceleration.

As noted above, the relative amplitude of self-excited vibrations is not constant and the motion is not a pure sinusoidal oscillation. Separation points, pressure distributions and correlation lengths are history dependent and thus the instantaneous states in forced and self-excited cases at the same amplitude and average frequency do not necessarily give rise to instantaneous similar correlation lengths, pressure distributions and sectional or total forces. The character of every cycle is determined by the cumulative effect of the prevailing conditions (Basset effect) and by the Schewe parameters. Every change in amplitude indicates a change in the lift force, which in turn, is a reflection of a mismatch between the vortex shedding frequency and the body frequency, leading to fluctuations in the shedding of vorticity. One can find better force and amplitude representations by accounting for the additional harmonics or by resigning to the use of time-averaged values. At present, there are no analytical models that would suggest the form of the non-linearity likely to be contributing to the dynamics of VIV. Thus, the amplitude needs to be represented with sufficient accuracy through the use of one of the approximate methods such as (a) the *harmonic analysis*; (b) *proper orthogonal decomposition (POD)*, also known as the Karhunen-Loève decomposition) is an optimal expansion scheme to discretize a random process (Loève, 1977). It has been used, e.g., by Cazemier, (1997); Lenarts, et al. (2001); Sarkar and Paidoussis, (2003); Cohen et al. (2003); (c) *force-state mapping* (Masri and Caughey, 1979; Meskell et al., 2001); or (d) *complex demodulation analysis* in dealing with non-exact periodic series (Bloomfield, 2000). Evangelinos and Karniadakis (1999) have successfully used the last method in connection with their work on the  $\mathbf{W}$  of a cable. If none of the above methods is used, it is suggested that Fourier-averaged force-transfer coefficients be calculated

using sufficiently large number of oscillations (experimental or numerical) and incorporated into Eq. (12) to create a model to predict the force as a function of time. Such a force equation should produce, for similar normalized parameters, the **lift** and phase, or the drag and the added-mass coefficients obtained from the forced oscillations.

The question is not whether the two fairly idealized VIVs (forced and free, with minimum  $Re$  larger than about 15,000) are exactly alike or not, but rather whether they are sufficiently alike to extract reliable information from each for purposes of comparison toward a physics-based understanding of VIV. The final decision regarding the applicability of the fixed-body data to the prediction of the characteristics of a freely oscillating body will depend on many more experiments (forced and self-excited) ~~with~~ other rigid and flexible bodies at much higher Reynolds numbers.

The comparison of the flow kinematics (often of **DPIV** pictures at low  $Re$ ) of two in-line constrained cylinders (one self-excited, one forced to oscillate) under highly idealized circumstances (in-line constrained rigid cylinder, small  $L/D$ , better correlation, small  $Re$ , uniform flow with relatively small turbulence) is ~~far~~ from sufficient to draw scientific and/or industrially significant conclusions regarding the dynamic similarity of self-excited and forced oscillations. The unconstrained rigid or elastic bodies (long cables ~~or~~ pipes with varying degrees of bending and **support** stiffness) often subjected to omni-directional waves, currents, and shear at much higher Reynolds numbers present highly complex problems. What may be true for the physics of the simplest cases may not at all hold true for the more realistic circumstances.

## 9. Experiments with forced oscillations

Following the pioneering experiments of Bishop and Hassan (1964) with cylinders subjected to forced oscillations in uniform flow, Protos et al. (1968), Toebes (1969), Jones et al. (1969), Mercier (1973), Stansby (1976), Sarpkaya (1978, 1979), Chen and Jendrzejczyk (1979). Staubli (1983). Moe and Wu (1990), **Cheng and Moretti (1991)**,

Gopalkrishnan (1993), Moe et al. (1994), Sarpkaya (1995), Carberry (2002), and Carberry et al. (2002) conducted experiments using forced oscillations.

Bishop and Hassan (1964) reported their lift and drag forces in arbitrary units and assumed the added mass coefficient to be equal to its ideal value of  $C_a = 1$ . This invalidated their force measurements and, for the same reason, those of Protos et al. (1968) and Toebe (1969). However, Protos et al., and Toebe were the first to point out the importance of the phase angle  $\phi$  in the determination of the direction of the power transfer between the fluid and the cylinder. Bishop and Hassan have identified two critical frequencies ( $f_{com}/f_{st} = 0.86$  and  $0.95$  at  $Re = 6000$  and  $A/D = 0.25$ ) delineating a hysteresis loop. The phase angle  $\phi$  (between the displacement and the excitation) started with a negative value and increased gradually to a positive value of about  $90^\circ$  at the lower critical frequency. Then the motion became unstable and the phase angle jumped from  $90^\circ$  to about  $180^\circ$ , with no intermediate values. However, when  $f_{com}/f_{st}$  was increased, from the lower to higher values, the branch of  $\phi \approx 170^\circ$ -degree was followed until the upper critical frequency was reached. Then the phase angle changed abruptly by  $180^\circ$ . In other words, there was no gradual phase change in the interval  $0.86 < f_{com}/f_{st} < 0.95$ . Many years later, Krishnamoorthy et al. (2001) noted, "... the phase switch does not occur abruptly. Instead, over several cycles of cylinder oscillations, both 'in-phase' and 'out-of-phase' vortex shedding occur during the transition." Our high-speed photographic recording (at a rate of 500 frames/s) of the forced oscillations of smooth as well as roughened cylinders have shown that the phase changes do in fact occur over several cycles.

Jones et al. (1969) forced a large cylinder to vibrate at small amplitudes, at very large  $Re = 1.9 \times 10^7$ . Their lift coefficients were very similar to those reported at relatively low Reynolds numbers. Mercier (1973) conducted forced in-line and transverse oscillations in the range  $4,000 < Re < 8,000$  and reported a variety of figures for mean and oscillatory drag coefficients as well as drag and inertia components of the lift force, as functions of the reduced velocity and  $A/D$ . Stansby (1976) conducted forced vibration experiments with a circular cylinder, and he too observed that the phase angle jumped about  $180^\circ$  in the lock-in range for decreasing  $f_{com}/f_{st}$  and increasing  $A/D$ . The switch occurred at  $f_{com}/f_{st} = 0.86$  (as in the case of Bishop and Hassan) at  $Re = 3,600$  and  $A/D = 0.25$ . Stansby associated his



observations with the wake width being greater for  $f_{com}/f_{st}$  below critical, to being smaller for  $f_{com}/f_{st}$  above critical. This reduced the question to what makes the relative wake width vary. Bearman and Currie (1979), working with a circular cylinder at much higher Reynolds numbers ( $Re = 2.4 \times 10^4$ ), reported no evidence of hysteretic behavior.

Carberry (2002) and Carberry et al. (2002) subjected circular cylinders to controlled sinusoidal oscillations transverse to a uniform flow at  $Re < 10^4$ . They observed many of the well-known characteristics of the forces and transitions as the frequency of oscillation passes through the Strouhal frequency. They have called them a ‘transition’ between the “*low- and high-frequency states*” although the frequency changes only slightly during the said transition. As noted earlier, it is a “phase transition” where the ‘jump’ in phase could indeed be very large. Carberry (2002), in an attempt to compare her data with those obtained previously, defined a “transition frequency”  $f_t$  at which sharp changes occur in the phase and amplitude of the lift force. Obviously,  $f_t$  differed from one data set to another. Thus, using  $f_{ex}/f_t$  rather than  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$ , she was able to bring into closer agreement the phase ( $\phi_{lift}$ ) and  $C_L$  data of Mercier (1973), Sarpkaya (1978), Staubli (1983), Gopalkrishnan (1993), and Carberry (2002), as shown in Fig. 11. All the data have been obtained at subcritical Reynolds numbers, ranging from as low as 2,300 to as high as  $6 \times 10^4$ , over the past 24 years. The  $Re$  values of Carberry (2002) are within the said range ( $Re = 2,300, 4,400, \text{ and } 9,100$ ), but her data exhibit notable differences from the mean of the others even in a plot pulled closer by  $f_{ex}/f_t$ . This appears to be partly due to the fact that her Reynolds numbers are considerably smaller than that required for the transition in the free shear layers to mature and partly due to the fact that a ‘transition frequency’  $f_t$  does not uniquely characterize a VIV event. Figure (12) shows  $C_{Lvortex}$  data of Carberry et al. (2002) for a range of  $A/D$  at  $Re = 2,300$  and for a range of  $Re$  (2,300 – 9,100) at  $A/D = 0.5$  as a function of  $f_{ex}/f_t$ . Their additional data at  $A/D = 0.25, 0.40, \text{ and } 0.60$  depict equally large variations with  $Re$  and  $A/D$  probably partly due to amplitude and frequency modulations, and the increase of the instability in the free shear layers with increasing  $Re$ , and partly due to the effects of a number of secondary parameters noted earlier. Carberry et al. (2002) have also noted that small differences in the motion of the cylinder can result in significant changes in the energy transfer.




Fig. 11. (a) and (b) show the phase angle ( $\phi_{lift}$ ) and the lift coefficient  $C_L$  in terms of  $f_a/f_t$ . Apparently, the data for  $Re$  less than about  $10^4 - 1.5 \times 10^4$  differ most from the rest even in a plot pulled together by  $f_a/f_t$ . This suggests that the average position of the transition from a disturbed-laminar state to a turbulent state in the free shear layers has not yet fully migrated upstream. (from Carberry, 2000).

Sarpkaya (1977a, b, 1978) carried out systematic measurements of forces acting on a rigid cylinder vibrating sinusoidally transverse to a uniform water flow ( $Re = 6 \times 10^3$  to  $3.5 \times 10^4$ ) and expressed the transverse-force coefficient in a manner consistent with the force decomposition discussed earlier [see Eqs. (14-15)]. For an ambient velocity of  $U = U_m \cos \omega_{com} t$ , it was reduced to

$$C_a = -C_L \cos \phi \quad \text{and} \quad C_d = C_L \sin \phi \quad (14-R)$$

and to,

$$\phi = \tan^{-1}(-C_d / C_a) = \tan^{-1} \left( 2\zeta \frac{f_{vac} f_{com}}{f_{vac}^2 - f_{com}^2} \right) \quad (16-R)$$




Fig. 12. shows that  $C_{L \text{ vortex}}$  increases with  $A/D$  for a given  $Re$ , and with  $Re$  for a given  $A/D$  in the range of Reynolds numbers used by Carberry et al. (2002) in their experiments (Carberry, Sheridan, Rockwell, 2002).

Sarpkaya (1978) presented the inertia or added-mass coefficient (component of lift in phase with the cylinder acceleration) and drag coefficient (component of lift in phase with the cylinder velocity) for various values of  $A/D$  in the range  $6 \times 10^3 < Re < 3.5 \times 10^4$ . He then used the data in a linear equation of motion to predict the amplitudes of oscillation of an elastically mounted self-excited cylinder. His predictions were in good agreement with the experimental data of Griffin and Koopmann (1977).

More recently, Sarpkaya (2003) repeated his 1978 experiments in a new water tunnel (with no free surface) at seven Reynolds numbers ( $2.5 \times 10^3$ ,  $7.5 \times 10^3$ ,  $12.5 \times 10^3$ ,  $15 \times 10^3$ ,  $20 \times 10^3$ , and  $45 \times 10^3$ ) with two 50-mm diameter cylinders with  $L/D = 7$  and  $A/D = 0.50$  (using a fast data acquisition system and an 'infinitely better' computer rather than several hundred punch cards for every data point as during 1975 to 78 period. One of the cylinders was polished to make it as smooth as possible and the other was specially modified for the exploration of VIV suppression. The velocity at

the test section (356 mm x 510 mm) ranged from 0.04 m/s to 0.92 m/s and the ambient turbulence at the lowest Re was 0.8% and at the highest Re was 1.2%.

Experiments for each Reynolds number were repeated at different weeks. The objectives of the rather ambitious program were: (a) to obtain reliable data at Reynolds numbers higher than that encountered in the 1978 experiments; and, more importantly, (b) to determine the dependence of the key quantifiable parameters (phase angle and the in-phase and out-of phase components of the transverse force) on the Reynolds number at discrete values of Re in the range  $2.5 \times 10^3 < \text{Re} < 45 \times 10^3$  using the same facility, experimental procedures, and test cylinder. Only the most important findings will be described in this review. The results and their detailed discussion will appear elsewhere (Sarpkaya, 2003).

We will first describe the results for  $\text{Re} = 45 \times 10^3$ . The mean lines passing through the new  $C_a$ ,  $C_d$ , and phase data for  $A/D = 0.5$  for  $\text{Re} = 45 \times 10^3$  are shown in Figs. 13 and 14 as a function of  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$  and  $V_r$ , respectively. The  $C_a$ ,  $C_d$ , and  $\phi$  data obtained at different weeks fell within respective error bands of 4%. These figures substantiate many of the observations made earlier by Sarpkaya (1978, 1979, 1995) and others since then (e.g., Staubli, 1983; Gopalkrishnan, 1993). Evidently, important variations occur in both  $C_a$  and  $C_d$  in the range  $0.80 < f_{ex}/f_{st} < 0.90$  and the positive values of  $C_d$  are the regions of primary and secondary synchronizations, which signify power transfer *from the fluid to the cylinder*.

The phase angle decreases rapidly from a value of about  $180^\circ$  to little above zero at  $f_{ex}/f_{st} \approx 1.5$ . In addition, important variations occur in all three parameters outside the **primary  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$  range** noted above. Figure 14 shows the same data as a function of  $V_r = U/Df_{ex}$  where, for a given  $U$  and  $D$ , the forcing frequency decreases along the  $V_r$  axis but the Reynolds number *remains* constant at  $\text{Re} = 45 \times 10^3$ . The data reveals that  $C_a$  decreases sharply from about 3.9 to about -0.6, as the reduced velocity increases from  $V_r \approx 3.5$  to 5.90.  $C_a$  then rises slowly to about -0.4 as  $V_r$  increases toward 10. This phenomenon occurs for a wide range of  $A/D$  values with different  $C_a$  values (see, Sarpkaya, 1978). The changes in  $C_a$  may be interpreted in a number of interesting ways using Eqs. (3d) or (3e), i.e.,  $(1 + C_a/m^*) = (f_{vac}/f_{ex})^2$  or the virtual mass  $= (m^* + C_a) = m^* (f_{vac}/f_{ex})^2$ . The decrease of  $C_a$  from large positive values




Fig. 13. Inertia and drag coefficients (or the in-phase and out-of phase components of the lift force) and the phase angle as a function of  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$  ( $A/D = 0.50$ ,  $Re = 45,000$ ,  $L/D = 7$ , smooth cylinder) (from author's experiments). Perfect synchronization is seen to occur at  $f_{ex}/f_{st} \approx 0.85$ , accompanied by rapid changes in phase and force-transfer coefficients. (Sarpkaya, 2003).




Fig. 14. Inertia and drag coefficients (or the in-phase and out-of phase components of the lift force) and the phase angle as a function of  $V_r = U/f_{ex} D$  ( $A/D = 0.50$ ,  $Re = 45,000$ ,  $L/D = 7$ , smooth cylinder) (from author's experiments). Perfect synchronization is seen to occur at  $V_r = 5.80-5.85$ , accompanied by rapid changes in phase and force-transfer coefficients (same as Fig. 13 except that the horizontal axis is changed to  $V_r$ ).

toward zero, as  $V_r$  approaches 5.85, shows that  $f_{ex}$  is rising toward  $f_{vac}$  (i.e., the virtual mass of the body is decreasing). At  $f_{vac}/f_{ex} = 1$ ,  $C_a = 0$ ,  $V_r \approx 5.85$  and the virtual mass of the body becomes equal to the actual mass of the body. Subsequently,  $C_a$  becomes negative and acquires its minimum value of about -0.6 (for  $A/D = 0.5$ ) at about  $V_r \approx 5.90$ . At that point, the body's apparent mass is the smallest it will ever be and  $f_{ex}$  is the largest it will ever get for this particular amplitude ( $A/D = 0.5$ ). In short,  $f_{ex}$  increases up to about  $V_r = 5.90$  and then decreases gradually while remaining larger than  $f_{vac}$ .

Figure 14 also shows that the drag coefficient  $C_d$  (the normalized out-of-phase component of the total instantaneous transverse force) rises sharply for  $V_r$  values from about 5 to 5.90, i.e., the drag is in phase with the direction of motion of the cylinder and helps to magnify the oscillations (positive energy transfer). It is positive also in the ranges  $3.2 < V_r < 4.4$  and  $5.90 < V_r < 10$ . The foregoing substantiates the fact already noted by Sarpkaya (1978) that "synchronization or lock-in is manifested by a rapid decrease in inertial force and a rapid increase in the absolute value of the drag force" and that "lock-in is a phase transformer." Sarpkaya (1978) further noted that "The data also show that the use of an inertia or added-mass coefficient equal to unity, as determined by oscillating the cylinder in a fluid otherwise at rest, is not correct for modeling the vortex-induced oscillations." Obviously, this fact has nothing to do with the shifting of the ideal added mass to the left side of the equation of motion and dealing only with the so-called 'vortex-induced forces,' as long as the *actual added mass* ( $\Delta m$ ), and *not its ideal value, is used in calculating the prevailing body frequency*, i.e.,  $f_{ex} = (1/2\pi)(k/(m + \Delta m))^{1/2}$ . Clearly, high  $m^*$  values diminish the contribution of  $C_d/m^*$  or  $\Delta m/m$  to the virtual mass. Conversely, very small values of  $m^*$  magnify the contribution of  $C_d/m^*$  (for positive values of  $C_a$ ) and lead to lock-in at very small excitation frequencies, as per Eq. (3d). Furthermore, the range of synchronization increases because the variation of  $f_{vac}/f_{ex}$  with respect to  $C_d/m^*$  decreases according to  $(1 + C_d/m^*)^{-1/2}$  and  $f_{vac}/f_{ex}$  loses its ability to delineate sharper frequency boundaries.

It has been noted a number of times that the added mass coefficient  $C_a$  can be negative with far reaching consequences for freely-vibrating cylinders. At first it appears paradoxical. However, further thought shows that  $C_a$  is the cycle-averaged

value of the sum of the masses transported during the periods of acceleration (cylinder moving toward the mean position, i.e.,  $y \rightarrow 0$ ) and deceleration (cylinder moving toward its maximum amplitude, i.e.,  $y \rightarrow |A|$ ). Thus, (cycle-averaged) negative added mass means that the drift mass during the deceleration periods is larger than that during the acceleration periods. The basic difference between the kinematics of the two cases is that during the deceleration periods, the velocity vector relative to the cylinder is oriented toward the axis of the wake, whereas during the periods of acceleration the said net velocity is toward the shear layer from which the cylinder is coming. Undoubtedly, this is a consequence of the particular behavior of the wake vortices during the said periods and the forces they exert on the cylinder (awaiting for a Direct Numerical Simulation of VIV at high Reynolds numbers, say  $Re > 15,000$ ). Similar “negative” added mass has been previously discussed by Keulegan and Carpenter 1958) and by Sarpkaya (1976a, b) in connection with the sinusoidal motion of flow relative to smooth and roughened cylinders. Subsequently, it has been discussed by numerous investigators (see, e.g., Vandiver, 1993; Gopalkrishnan 1993; Vikestad et al. 2000). According to Vandiver (1993), “a negative added mass simply reflects the sign of the fluid force on the cylinder being in phase with the acceleration.” In self-excited oscillations, the occurrence of amplitude and frequency modulations is accompanied by corresponding changes in the added mass. For example, a change of  $\Delta(f_{vac}/f_{com})$  leads to a change of  $\Delta(C_d/m^*) = 2(f_{vac}/f_{com}) \Delta(f_{vac}/f_{com})$ , which could be very large when  $f_{com}$  is relatively small as in the case of small  $m^*$ .

The second objective of our experiments was to determine the dependence of the phase angle and the in-phase and out-of phase components of the transverse force on the Reynolds number at seven discrete values of  $Re$  in the range  $2.5 \times 10^3 < Re < 45 \times 10^3$ , using the same facility, experimental procedures, and test cylinder. This was prompted by the well-known fact that the Gerrard-Bloor transition waves in the free shear layers disappear in the range of Reynolds numbers from about  $Re \cong 2 \times 10^4$  to  $5 \times 10^4$  in steady flow about a stationary cylinder. Bloor (1964) measured the frequency of transition waves within  $1.3 \times 10^3 < Re < 4.5 \times 10^4$  (see also, Bloor and Gerrard, 1966; Gerrard, 1978; Wei and Smith, 1986; Unal and Rockwell, 1988; Ahmed and Wagner, 2003; Zdravkovich, 1997, 2003; Norberg, 2003). When the Reynolds number reaches about  $2 \times 10^4$ , the near wake becomes highly three-

dimensional, and the eddy formation length does not move closer to the separation point. Unfortunately, there are no comparable *direct* observations and measurements with cylinders subjected to VIV. Thus, the critical value of  $Re_{sl}$  at which the cycle averaged eddy formation length remains nearly stationary is not yet known. Furthermore, direct measurements to gather such data appear to be prohibitively difficult. Owing to these facts, we have chosen the three parameters noted above ( $C_a$ ,  $C_d$ ,  $\phi$ ) to deduce *indirect* information about the effect of the evolution of the unsteady free shear layers, knowing fully well that the variations observed from one  $Re$  to another at the same  $A/D$  are not exclusively due to the variations in the shear layers. However, it is not too difficult to assume that the shear layers will certainly have a predominant effect on what happens to the generation of vorticity, shedding of vortices, phase angle and the force components.

The data obtained at different weeks at each Reynolds number were compared with each other as well as with those at consecutive Reynolds numbers ( $2.5 \times 10^3$ ,  $7.5 \times 10^3$ ,  $12.5 \times 10^3$ ,  $15 \times 10^3$ ,  $20 \times 10^3$ , and  $45 \times 10^3$ , all with  $A/D = 0.5$ ). For smaller values of  $Re$  ( $2.5 \times 10^3$  and  $7.5 \times 10^3$ ), the differences between the force coefficients were indeed as large as those encountered by Carberry et al. (2002) with  $A/D = 0.5$  and  $Re = 2.3 \times 10^3$ ,  $4.4 \times 10^3$ , and  $9.1 \times 10^3$ , as shown in Fig. 12. However, when the Reynolds number was increased to  $12.5 \times 10^3$ , the variations in data relative to  $Re = 7.5 \times 10^3$  became smaller but certainly larger than the usual scatter in the data. The phase angle exhibited the largest difference, particularly for  $f_{ex}/f_{st} > 0.9$ . When  $Re$  was increased to  $15 \times 10^3$  and then to  $20 \times 10^3$ , the differences between the tracing parameters reduced to the level of the scatter observed in each experiment. The comparison of the data for  $Re = 20 \times 10^3$  and  $Re = 45 \times 10^3$  confirmed the conclusion that all three 'identification parameters' stabilize and do not materially depend on the Reynolds number, at least in the range  $15 \times 10^3 < Re < 45 \times 10^3$ . It is tempting to assume that this conclusion will remain true for all  $Re$  in the lower subcritical range of Reynolds numbers for smooth uniform flows about smooth circular cylinders, at least for  $A/D = 0.5$ . Obviously, experiments at larger  $A/D$  values and Reynolds numbers are desirable.

Staubli (1983) measured the fluid forces acting on a transversely oscillating circular cylinder in a towing tank. His work was essentially similar to that of



Sarpkaya (1978), but at a higher Reynolds number ( $Re \approx 60,000$ ). Staubli predicted the vibrations of a freely oscillating cylinder (by Feng, 1968) using the results of his measurements. In general, he found good agreement with the experimental data. He has shown that hysteresis effects, which are observed in experiments with elastically mounted cylinders of certain damping and mass ratios, are caused by the nonlinear relation between the fluid force and the amplitude of oscillation. Staubli did not present drag and inertia coefficients. However, they can be derived from his lift force and phase data and vice versa as shown in the present paper.

Moe and Wu (1990) have undertaken a major effort to conduct both free and forced oscillation experiments using the same apparatus. The cylinders were suspended such that they were (a) free in both the in-line and transverse directions; (b) clamped in the in-line direction, free in the transverse direction; (c) clamped in-line, forced in the transverse direction; and (d) free in the in-line direction and forced to vibrate in the transverse direction. Moe and Wu (1990) have obtained a number of important results: (1) the use of the true or prevailing oscillation frequency (our  $f_{com}$ ) results in very similar lock-in ranges for both the forced and free oscillations; (2) large self-excited cross-flow motions occur for a wider range of the reduced velocity if the cylinders are free to execute figure-eight motions than if they are restrained in the in-line direction; (3) the lift force is irregular for all test cases, and most so for the self-excited case; and (4) relatively large random effects exist in the lift force of the cylinder undergoing self-excited or forced vibrations as seen in Figs. 9(a) and (b). These effects are stronger for the in-line fixed cases than for the in-line spring-supported ones.

Gopalkrishnan (1993) carried out forced oscillation experiments in a towing tank ( $Re = 10^4$ ) and produced extensive plots of the lift force and phase. He measured the reaction force only at one end of the test cylinder (suspended at both ends) but performed the data reduction by assuming a uniformly distributed load. Thus, the effects of three-dimensional conditions (e.g., the spanwise variations of the flow) in a nominally two-dimensional flow were not accounted for. His data, as well as those obtained by Sarpkaya (1978) and Moe and Wu (1990), were compared by Sarpkaya (1995) by plotting the in-phase and out-of-phase components of the lift force (for  $A/D = 0.25, 0.50$ , and  $0.75$ ) as a function of  $V_r St = (U/Df_{ex})(f_{st} D/U) = f_{st}/f_{ex}$  in order to

account for the variations in Strouhal number (and the Reynolds number) among the three experiments. The level of agreement between the three sets of data suggested Blevins (1999) that the drag and inertia coefficients obtained by Mercier (1973), Sarpkaya (1978), Staubli (1983), Wu (1989), Deep Oil Technology (1992), and Gopalkrishnan (1993) may be combined in a single database and represented with semi-empirical correlations for design purposes only.

The test cylinders in the experiments noted above were constrained to remain in the transverse plane. As noted earlier, Moe and Wu (1990) carried out additional, but limited, tests with cylinders not-constrained in the in-line direction (using suitable springs). Interestingly enough, the random variations in the lift force turned out to be smaller for the in-line-unrestrained cases than for the in-line-restrained cases. Clearly, the data obtained with in-line-restrained rigid cylinders may be of limited use under certain circumstances, particularly when the natural frequency of the cylinder in the in-line direction is made or becomes increasingly larger than that in the transverse direction. Thus, the exploration of the biharmonic motion of a cylinder elastically-supported in both directions becomes an issue even more important than that of an in-line restrained cylinder subjected to amplitude-modulated beating motions. Gopalkrishnan, et al. (1992) subjected rigid cylinders, restrained in the in-line direction, to amplitude modulated (beating) motions and expressed the transverse force in terms of an "equivalent lift coefficient."

Sarpkaya (1995) discussed the significance of two-directional or biharmonic oscillations (in both the in-line and transverse directions) in light of experiments undertaken for that purpose, to simulate more closely the true nature of flow-induced vibrations. His data, reproduced here as Fig. 15, have shown that the variation of  $A/D$  with  $V_r$  for the case of 'in-line free' oscillations (i.e., with *identical natural frequencies and identical oscillating masses in each of the X and Y directions*) yields about 20% larger amplitudes over a 20% larger  $V_r St = f_{st}/f_{ex}$  range for a Reynolds number of about  $35 \times 10^3$ . Obviously, the increase in  $A/D$  is not 'a slight increase', contrary to the unfortunate misinterpretation of our data by Jauvtis and Williamson (2002). The fact of the matter is that VIV depends on a large number of parameters which include  $m^*$  as well as the Reynolds number. The variations of  $A/D$  for other natural frequency ratios (in-line versus transverse) are considerably more complex,




Fig. 15 (a) the normalized drag coefficient; and, (b)  $A/D$  are shown for three cases for  $Re = 35,000$ : (1) in-line free, (2) in-line restricted, and (3)  $f_{ex}/f_{ey} = 2$ . It is seen that both  $C_d/C_{d0}$  and  $A/D$  for the case of 'the same natural frequency in both directions' yield about 20% larger values over a 20% larger  $V_r St (= f_y/f_x)$  range. However, the variations of  $A/D$  for other natural frequency ratios (in-line versus transverse) are considerably more complex (Sarpkaya, 1995).

indicating dramatic changes in the wake. Moe and Wu (1990) have noted that the separation points and pressure distribution are strongly affected by the previous history of the motion and the average forces differ from the forces at the average amplitude due to the strong non-linearity of the in-phase and out-of phase components of the transverse force. Jong and Vandiver (1985) and, subsequently, Vandiver and Jong (1987) studied the identification of the quadratic system relating cross-flow and in-line vortex-induced vibrations and the relationship between the in-line and cross-flow vortex-induced oscillations of cylinders. They have concluded that a strong quadratic relationship exists between the in-line and cross-flow motions under both lock-in and non-lock-in conditions and that the well-known frequency doubling phenomena in the in-line response is a consequence of such a quadratic

correlation. In other words, the motions in two directions are *not independent* of each other. Only, Jauvtis and Williamson (2002), while experimenting with a cylinder (with the same in-line and transverse natural frequency of 0.4 **Hz**) in two-degrees of freedom, in the range of small Reynolds numbers ( $1,000 < Re < 6,000$ ), found that “the freedom to oscillate in-line with the flow affects the transverse vibration surprisingly little” and arrived at the far reaching conclusion that the studies of the past (presumably at lower Reynolds numbers) on bodies “restrained to move only laterally to the fluid flow remain relevant and valid for the problem of VIV of a body in two-degrees of freedom.” In other words, no ‘dramatic changes’ should be expected in the vortex shedding, forces, and responses of bodies free to vibrate in both the in-line and transverse directions relative to the responses of those restrained to vibrate only in the cross-flow direction. Their results and conclusions should be restricted to the range of  $Re < 6,000$ , and certainly not generalized to Reynolds numbers larger than about  $15 \times 10^3$  to  $20 \times 10^3$ , for reasons noted earlier. In direct contradiction of Jauvtis and Williamson (2002), Marcollo and Hinwood (2002) found, in connection with their work on ‘the cross-flow and in-line responses of a long flexible cylinder subjected to uniform flow,’ that “The in-line vibration **is** found to have a strong dependency on the cross-flow vibration and is forced at frequencies very different to that which would be predicted *apriori*.” It **is** obvious from the foregoing and from a more careful perusal of our data shown in Fig. 15 that the interaction of cross flow and in-line oscillations leads to substantially different results from those found at very small Reynolds numbers. It is also obvious that the conclusions derived from ‘small Re-VIV’ experiments should be confined to small Reynolds numbers. As we shall discuss later, both the laboratory [e.g., Triantafyllou et al. (2003) at  $Re = 30,000$ ] and the field data at large Reynolds numbers are in conformity with our findings.

## 10. The wake and the VIV

The most appropriate place for a brief review of the structures in the wake of a body undergoing VIV at relatively low Reynolds numbers appeared to be between the discussions of the forced and self-excited oscillations. Enormous progress in computers, and in flow visualization and measurement devices led to the description and classification of the wake states of the simplest bodies, albeit at relatively small

Reynolds numbers, and reduced the fundamental questions of VIV from: (a) under what circumstances do the various types of VIV occur; and (b) what are the controlling and influencing parameters in all ranges of  $m^*\zeta$ ; to: (1) why do the vortices in the wake shed as two vortex pairs per cycle under certain conditions and as two single vortices in a cycle (as Karman vortices) under other circumstances; and (2) what is the role of vortices in the cause and effect relationship between their motion, hysteresis, and the controlling and influencing parameters?

Angrilli, Di Silvio, and Zanardo (1972) pioneered a number of experiments to establish a relationship between the vortex shedding and the cylinder displacement. They were the first to introduce the concept of 'time of vortex origin' and to suggest that VIV should be called a 'self-controlled' or 'self-regulated' phenomenon rather than a 'self-excited' one since the alternating lift force is not initiated and maintained by the body motion to exist or to persist like galloping. Figure 16 shows the successive positions of the vortices from photographs. Angrilli et al. (1972) have found that "as long as the oscillation is small, as in Fig. 16(a), vortex trails are not very different from those produced by a stationary bluff body, but for larger oscillations, as in Figs. 16(a)-(b), the two vortex trajectories must cross each other twice to reach a stable configuration in the wake."




Fig. 16. The successive positions of the vortices from photographs; (a) vortex trails are not very different from those produced by a stationary bluff body as long as the oscillation is small; (b) The two vortex trajectories must cross (twice) each other to reach a stable configuration in the wake for larger oscillations (Angrilli, Di Silvio, and Zanardo, 1972).

Zdravkovich (1982, see also 1990, 1996) was the first to compare the flow visualizations of others about circular cylinders subjected to forced or free vibrations. He suggested that the phase change (about  $\pi$ ) in the unsteady lift force near synchronization is connected to a switch in the timing of vortex shedding. This has subsequently been confirmed by Gu et al. (1994) at a relatively low amplitude ( $A/D = 0.2$ ) and by Lu and Dalton (1996) through numerical simulations (Fig. 17). Based on the flow visualization studies of Den Hartog (1934), Meier-Windhorst (1939), Angrilli, et al. (1972), Griffin and Ramberg (1974), Zdravkovich (1982) pointed out that two modes of drastically different vortex shedding occur in the lock-in range. At the beginning of the said range, the vortex formed on one side of the cylinder is shed when the cylinder is near the maximum displacement on the opposite side. However, toward the end of the lock-in range, the vortex is shed when the cylinder is near its maximum displacement on the same side. Zdravkovich (1982) also observed that the limit between these two modes is at the reduced velocity at which the maximum amplitude occurs. Ongoren and Rockwell (1988a, b), using hydrogen bubbles and hot film, have observed finer details of the vortical structures on either side of the phase shift of  $\pi$ .




Fig. 17. Instantaneous streamlines (left) and vorticity contours (right) for various  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$  ( $A/D = 0.4$ ,  $Re = 1000$ ). In all cases, the location of the cylinder is at its extreme upper position. At  $f_{ex}/f_{st} = 0.95$ , a new vortex is being shed from the upper surface. However, at  $f_{ex}/f_{st} = 1.0$ , the shedding has switched to the lower surface (Lu and Dalton, 1996).

Williamson and Roshko (1988, hereafter referred to as WR) addressed the questions “Why does the vortex formation change its character through synchronization, and why does it change *so* suddenly at a critical wavelength?” They have moved a vertical cylinder along a sinusoidal path ( $300 < Re < 1000$ ) in a fluid otherwise at rest and photographed the path of suspended aluminum particles on the free surface of the tank. They asserted that the dynamics of the vortices in the near wake is basically inviscid over the said Reynolds number range. As noted earlier, the shear layers could not have yet developed instabilities in the said Re range toward transition and turbulence. Thus, the observations *may not be relevant to higher Reynolds numbers*. Furthermore, the surfactants (suspended, non-dissolvable aluminum particles) are known to affect strongly the position and strength of vortices and vorticity distribution at and near the free surface, particularly at small Reynolds numbers (see, Sarpkaya, 1996b). They have mentioned that the aluminum-particle technique “has been used in conjunction with a dye method beneath the surface to show that the vortex patterns are similar.” However, the results of the dye technique have never been reported.

WR (1988) described, in the range ( $300 < Re < 1000$ ), the emergence of various regimes (see Fig. 18) in a map of  $A/D$  versus  $f_{st}/f_{ex}$  (as well as  $\lambda/D = U/f_{ex}D$ ), where  $\lambda$  is the wavelength. For  $U/f_{ex}D$  (or  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$ ) larger than a critical value, the wake manifests itself *as long attached shear layers*. Two counter-rotating vortex pairs are shed per cycle in the so-called 2P mode, as shown in Fig. 19(a), (from Brika and Laneville, 1993). The 2P mode is associated with the splitting of a region of vorticity in each half-cycle. The DPIV measurements of GW (2001) have **shown** that the vortices of the 2P mode “convect laterally outwards from the wake centerline, causing a downstream oriented jet type flow close to the cylinder, which in turn results in a ‘double-wake’ type velocity profile.” The 2S mode, depicted in Fig. 19(b), represents the alternate shedding of vortices in the classical Karman mode. Figure 20 is a plot by KW (1999) of their data ( $Re \approx 3,700$ ) on the map shown in Fig. 18 showing that the lower-branch regime (see Figs. 2(b) and (c) for definitions) collapses well when plotted against  $f_{st}/f_{ex}$ .

The region delineated by  $0 < A/D < 0.8$  and  $0.40 < f_{ex}/f_{st} < 1.80$  in Fig. 18 has been replotted in Fig. 21b in terms of increasing the excitation frequency to relate the




Fig. 18-(above). Map of vortex synchronization patterns near the fundamental lock-in region. The critical curve marks the transition from one mode of vortex shedding to another (Williamson and Roshko, 1988).

Fig. 19-(right) Photographs and sketches showing the two near-wake patterns responsible for the hysteresis loop ( $V_{rb} = 0.93$ ,  $Re = 7350$ ). (a) 2P mode ( $A/D = 0.40$ ); (b) 2S mode ( $A/D = 0.27$ ). Both photographs are taken at maximum negative displacement of the cylinder (Brika and Laneville, 1993).





Fig. 20-(left).  $A/D$  for  $Re = 3700$  and two  $m^*$  values plotted in the Williamson-Roshko (1988) map. Circles,  $m^* = 1.19$  and  $(m^* + C_A) = 0.011$ ; triangles,  $m^* = 8.63$  and  $(m^* + C_A) = 0.0145$ . Solid symbols indicate the lower-branch regimes (Khalak & Williamson, 1999; and Govardhan & Williamson, 2000).






Fig. 21. Top half: Sarphkaya's data shown in Fig. 13,  $Re = 45,000$ ; bottom half: a replot of Williamson-Roshko (1988) map,  $Re = 300-1000$ .

while remaining negative (i.e., the virtual mass of the oscillating system achieves its minimum value for the specific amplitude). On the critical curve, the **2P** mode changes rather abruptly to the **2S** mode, shown in Fig. 21(b), but only for  $A/D$  values smaller than about 0.75. The **2S** mode is characterized by the shedding of a single vortex in each half cycle, like Karman vortex shedding, and by rapid increases in  $C_L \sin \phi$ , phase angle and the added mass coefficient. In fact, the well-known recirculation bubble of the mean velocity field of the wake of a *stationary* cylinder manifests its presence in the **2S** mode, showing that the **2S**-mode of shedding, coupled with the cylinder motion, may lead to even more dynamic and organized motion. In particular, the coefficient of lift, enhanced by improved correlation, becomes even larger than that for a fixed circular cylinder in steady flow, emphasizing the fact that the use of all active and passive means to prevent the wake from shifting to the

various modes relative to the changes in the added mass, the out-of-phase component of the force, and the phase angle in our data [see Figs. 14 and 21(a)], notwithstanding the large differences between the Reynolds numbers of WR (1988): ( $300 < Re < 1,000$ ), and ours:  $Re = 45,000$ .

Near the left boundary of the **2P** mode, in the WR map, the out-of-phase component of the lift force (energy input to the cylinder) is small and the phase angle is large (about  $\pi$ ) as seen in Fig. 21a. As one approaches the critical curve along a constant  $A/D$  line (say, 0.5), the phase angle decreases rapidly, the out-of-phase component of the lift increases towards its maximum (i.e., more energy transfer from the fluid to the cylinder), and the added mass coefficient approaches its minimum value

2S mode is most desirable for all practical purposes. The rate at which the velocity step is increased changes the vorticity generated on the cylinder boundary. The increased vortex strength might precipitate an earlier hysteretic jump in  $A/D$ . For small increments, the vorticity generated is small and diffuses faster without making an impact on the strength of vortices or on the energy transferred to the cylinder. The critical value of  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$  is an important example. For  $A/D = 0.50$ , it is seen to be about 0.85 in Figs. 14 and 21. According to Carberry et al. (2002), the transition occurs in the range of  $f_{ex}/f_{st} = 0.84 - 0.87$  (for  $Re = 2,300$ ). However, according to WR (1988), the critical value is at  $f_{ex}/f_{st} \approx 0.94$  for  $A/D = 0.50$ , as seen in Figs. 18 and 21b. The difference between this value and those noted above may be due to the use of relatively low Reynolds numbers ( $300 < Re < 1000$ ), as noted above. Even though in the said  $Re$  range, and up to about  $Re = 10^4$ , the Strouhal number for a stationary cylinder remains nearly constant, the all-the-more important shear layer transition to turbulence for VIV (coherence length and separation angle) occurs at Reynolds number well above  $10^3$ . Apparently, on the basis of what has been said so far, the critical line in Fig. 21 must be shifted to the left (to the right in the original plot of WR, Figs. 18 and 20) by an amount  $\Delta(f_{ex}/f_{st}) \approx 0.10$  at the level of  $A/D = 0.5$ . Other values of  $A/D$  and  $Re$  may require different amounts of shift. This will improve the agreement between their map and the data by Brika and Laneville (1993); KW (1999); and GW (2000). Finally, it is worth noting that accurate numerical solutions at relatively low Reynolds number (e.g., Blackburn and Henderson 1999 at  $Re = 500$ ) do not find the 2P mode. Evangelinos and Kamiadakis (1999) at  $Re = 1,000$  found multiple vorticity concentrations and transient mixtures of (P+S) and 2P modes in the near wake and general wake instability further downstream. The repeat of the WR (1988) experiments in a closed system at Reynolds numbers larger than  $1.5 \times 10^4$ , without the use of surfactants, is most desirable.

Rodriguez and Pruvost (2000) used a vertical tank, a slightly heated metal cylinder, spanning the width of the test section, and the schlieren technique (based on variations of the liquid refraction index with temperature). Experiments were conducted at a Reynolds number of 700, at eight different amplitudes ranging from  $A/D = 0.125$  to  $A/D = 1$ . The vortex-shedding phase was defined with respect to the cylinder position  $y/A$  at the time of shedding. A vortex is considered shed when it is cut from its feeding sheet in a manner similar to that introduced by Sarpkaya and

Shoaff (1979) in their discrete vortex simulation of flow-induced vibrations. Rodriguez and Pruvost (2000) spanned the synchronization region by varying the cylinder oscillation frequency ( $f_{ex}$ ) in small steps while holding the amplitude  $A/D$  constant at one of the desired values. They have measured the prevailing vortex shedding frequency *in the wake*  $f_{vs}$ , as previously done by Cheng and Moretti (1991). They have presented extensive data and photographs (see Fig. 22) for a large number of subharmonics. Their methods of identifying the various phenomena and their use of significantly different notations (e.g., L and U for the vortices shed from the lower and upper sides of the cylinder) made their results somewhat difficult to interpret. Nevertheless, Rodriguez and Pruvost (2000) have substantiated the fact previously noted by Blevins (1990) that the maximum lift coincides with the shedding of the L-vortices and the minimum lift with that of the U-vortices. This is because the shedding of ~~an~~ L-vortex causes the separation point on the upper surface to move *downstream*. This, in ~~turn~~, accelerates the flow on the top surface and increases the lift. Rodriguez and Pruvost (2000) have also noted that the motion of a cable (their primary objective) is directly related to the nature of the coupling of the numerous synchronization ranges and therefore it is important to assess whether such coupling can occur in the range of  $0 < A/D < 1$  and, how and when the transition from one mode to another occurs if the velocity in the far-field varies with time.

It has been known since the 1960's that the transition, the wake states on




Fig. 22. Wake vortex structure over several oscillations for  $f_{ex}D/U = 0.109$ ,  $f_{ex}/f_{vs} = 1/2$  and  $A/D = 0.237$  (Rodriguez and Pruvost, 2000).

either side of the transition, and the way in which they occur depend on the governing parameters and the Schewe parameters given by Eqs. (2) and (17). The singling out of a frame or two in the high- or low-phase regions of the oscillation is not too meaningful because the inertial forces called into action prevent an abrupt rupture of the prevailing conditions where there can be almost seamlessly incremental transitions from cycle to cycle. **As** noted earlier, Krishnamoorthy et al. (2001) have observed that “the phase switch does not occur abruptly. Instead, over several cycles of cylinder oscillations, both ‘in-phase’ and ‘out-of-phase’ vortex shedding occur during the transition.” Other works dealing with the comparison of the wake states of free and forced oscillations is deferred to the next section for reasons which will become clear later.

## 11. Self-excited vibrations

Numerous contributions have been made toward the understanding of the kinematics and dynamics of self-excited vibrations of mostly circular cylinders: Marris and Brown (1963), Vickesy and Watkins (1964); Koopmann (1967b); Feng (1968); Di Silvio (1969); Gowda (1975); Angrilli, Di Silvio, and Zanardo (1972); Griffin (1972); Griffin and Ramberg (1974); Di Silvio, Angrilli, and Zanardo (1975); Stansby (1976); Griffin and Koopmann (1977); Dean, Milligan, and Wooton (1977); Zdravkovich (1982, 1990, 1996); Williamson and Roshko (1988); Brika and Laneville (1993); Vandiver (1993); Moe, et al. (1994); Skop and Balasubramanian (1997); Hover, Miller, and Triantafyllou (1997); Hover, Techet and Triantafyllou (1998); Atsavapranee, Benaroya, and Wei (1998); Zhou, So and Lam (1999); Khalak and Williamson (1999); Govardhan and Williamson (2000); Pesce and Fajjarra (2000); Lague and Laneville (2002); Voorhees and Wei (2002); and on numerical simulations of long flexible cables by Newman and Karniadakis (1997); Bartran et al. (1999); Evangelinos and Karniadakis (1999); Triantafyllou, Davis, Hover, Landolt (2001); Triantafyllou, Techet, Hover, Yue (2003). Here only a few of these contributions will be discussed in some detail.

**As** noted earlier, the most interesting phenomena in VIV are hysteresis and lock-idlock-out. For a given system, the occurrence of hysteresis depends on the approach to the resonance range—the rate of change of the velocity (with small or

large increments or decrements) from a low or from a high velocity. The jump condition (double amplitude response) originates in the fluid system, and not, as once thought, in the cylinder elastic system.

Marris and Brown (1963) were interested with the elastic response of Pitot tubes under normal operating conditions. Each tube was cantilevered (in its plane of motion) to one of the walls of a water channel and subjected to uniform flow in the range ( $1000 < Re < 2000$ ). Marris and Brown were able to change the length of the tube and hence its frequency. They have determined two lengths (and hence two frequencies) one of which was 35% larger than  $f_{st}$  and the other, about 35% lower than  $f_{st}$ . Thus, they were able to bracket the synchronization range of the tubes. To the best of our knowledge, no one has ever varied the frequency of the test beam by changing its length (and, of course, mass and damping ratios), except in industrial applications to avoid synchronization.

Feng (1968), inspired by Parkinson (1974, 1989), made one of the widely known contributions to VTV. Experiments were carried out in a wind tunnel with a single-degree-of-freedom flexible cylinder with  $m^* = 248$ ,  $\zeta = 0.00103$  and  $m^*\zeta = 0.255$ , as shown in Figs. 1 and 2. Feng measured  $f_{ex}$ ,  $f_{st}$ ,  $A/D$ , and the phase angle  $\phi$  for three types of experiments: (a) the cylinder started from rest at a prescribed velocity  $U$ ; (b) the velocity was increased by small increments while the cylinder was oscillating at a steady-state amplitude; and (c) the velocity was decreased by small increments while the cylinder oscillated at a steady-state amplitude. His phase and  $A/D$  data were presented as a function of  $V_r = U/f_{vac}D$ . For the first type of experiments, Feng found that for  $V_r$  less than about 5,  $A/D$  is very small (the inception phase of oscillations) and the frequency of excitation of the cylinder,  $f_{ex}$  is smaller than  $f_{vac}$  and  $f_{vs}$ . For  $V_r$  larger than about 5,  $f_{vs}$  and  $f_{ex}$  became one and the same or, what we prefer to call, the common frequency  $f_{com}$ , i.e., the lock-in occurred. The amplitude smoothly rose to a maximum value of  $A/D = 0.32$  at about  $V_r = 6$ . However, at  $V_r \approx 7$ , lock-out occurred, i.e., the vortices returned to their Strouhal relationship and the cylinder, to a frequency very close to  $f_{vac}$ , and, with further increases in velocity, the amplitude dropped to negligible values near  $V_r = 8.6$ .

For the second type experiments (velocity increased by small increments while the cylinder was oscillating), the amplitude reached a much higher value ( $A/D = 0.53$ )

at about the same  $V_r$  ( $\approx 6$ ) where the maximum of ( $A/D = 0.32$ ) occurred in the previous case. However, when  $V_r$  reached a value of about **6.4**,  $A/D$  dropped sharply to the value that was reached from rest at the same wind speed. This drop was accompanied by a change of about  $35^\circ$  in phase and, most certainly, by a change in the wake structure. When the speed was decreased, the amplitude data followed the 'steady flow' case up to a special  $V_r$  value of 5.9 at which a second 'smaller' jump back to the higher values occurred. This resulted in a ***clockwise oscillation hysteresis loop***, as shown in Fig. 1. This jump was accompanied by a phase change of about  $60^\circ$  and a ***counter-clockwise phase-hysteresis loop***, signaling very interesting changes in the shedding mode of vortices.

There are a number of similarities as well as differences (e.g., the synchronization and hysteresis covered by the velocity range, jumps in the phase) between the data obtained by Bishop and Hassan (1964), Feng (1968), and Brika and Laneville (1993), and for a flexible cylinder by Wu (1989), Saltara et al. (1998), and Pesce and Fajarda (2000), probably due to the differences in  $A/D$ ,  $Re$ ,  $m^*$ ,  $\zeta$ , the test bodies (cable and rigid cylinders), and the Schewe parameters.

Brika and Laneville (1993, hereafter referred to as BL) performed a series of very thorough and well-documented experiments in a wind tunnel with a ***flexible circular tube*** ( $m^* = 2,054$ ) in the range of relatively low Reynolds numbers (from  $3.4 \times 10^3$  to  $11.8 \times 10^3$ ) and small damping ratios (from  $\zeta = 0.83 \times 10^{-4}$  for small amplitudes to  $\zeta = 2 \times 10^{-4}$  for higher amplitudes, up to a maximum of  $A/D = 0.52$ ). A flexible cylinder was to simulate half of the wavelength of a vibrating cable and to eliminate the end effects. BL (1993) have performed tests in two regimes: PR: the 'progressive regime' in which the velocity of air was either (a) increased or (b) decreased ***at small increments*** while the cylinder was oscillating at its steady-state amplitude; and, IR: the 'impulsive regime' in which the velocity of air was fixed and the cylinder was either (a) released from rest, or (b) externally excited by a shaker, at an amplitude  $A/D$  of the order of 0.85, and then released. Furthermore, as an additional experiment, the regime of PR(a) was repeated using a velocity step ***twice as large*** as the original small step. Figure 23 shows a comparison of the data obtained in the impulsive regimes with those obtained in the progressive regime ***as a function of***  $V_{r,b} = (V_r/2\pi) = U/2\pi f_{ex}D$ . It should be noted that BL (1993) have plotted their data using




Figure 23. The steady-state vibration amplitude  $A/D$  of the impulsive regimes as a function of  $V_{rb} = (V_r/2\pi) = U/(2\pi f_{ex} D)$  is compared with the results of the progressive regime: \*, from rest; o, from a pre-excited amplitude; -----, progressive regime (Brika & Laneville, 1993). The similarity of their data to those obtained by Feng (1968) is quite striking (Brika & Laneville, 1993).

$f_{ex}$  in defining  $V_r$  rather than  $f_{vac}$  (the so-called undamped natural frequency). However, the two frequencies in their in-air experiments do not differ much.

The obvious and striking features of the data shown in Fig. 23 are their similarity to those obtained by Feng (1968). The hysteresis emphasizes once again the fact that 'one can go a little further if one goes slower and then jumps to where one should be' or 'one jumps sooner, a little higher, if one goes faster, and then ends up at the same  $A/D$ '. The phase angle (not shown here) follows the jumps in  $A/D$  quite faithfully. In the regime PR-a, (small increments in velocity),  $A/D$  increases and reaches 0.53 at  $V_{rb} = 1$ . The next step (at  $V_r \approx 1.01$ ) is into an abyss that reduces  $A/D$  to 0.38 (i.e., onto the data for P-b, the small decrement line) and increases  $\varphi$  by about  $70^\circ$ . Subsequently,  $A/D$  decreases to very small values at  $V_r \approx 1.31$ . If the regime PR-a is repeated with a larger step, as noted above, the amplitude data follows the PR-a (small increment data) up to  $A/D = 0.13$  ( $V_r \approx 0.87$ ) and then jumps to  $A/D = 0.40$  and then continues to decrease as in the case of PR-a (small increment). Obviously, it takes a sufficiently large velocity increment (at the right time) to force the vortices to

change to a new configuration sooner. In the absence of a stronger impulse, a stronger velocity, arrived at gradually, serves the same purpose. However, a closer look at the data and the amplitude traces (not reproduced here) reveal that there are subtle differences between the two modes. For example, in the narrow range of  $V_r \approx 0.88$  and  $V_r \approx 0.95$ , there are two possible steady-state amplitudes for a given velocity as far as the pre-excitation procedure (IR-b) is concerned. BL (1993) have pointed out that for velocities larger than the synchronization onset velocity ( $V_{rb} = 0.78$ ) and smaller than the lower critical velocity (LCV), the recording of the amplitude build-up from rest show intriguing behavior. While the system first tends toward **an unavailable final state** on **an** imaginary extension of the lower branch ( $V_r < 0.88$ ), it suddenly departs, at a point defined by a break in the envelope curve, toward a second and available steady state of the upper branch. Such bifurcations in the envelope curves are accompanied by an abrupt change in the phase angle and in the wake flow regime.

BL (1993) have ascertained that the phase remains constant along the cable (a flexible tube) within  $\pm 5^\circ$  and concluded that the flow mode is not affected by the variation of the vibration amplitude along the cable and that their results should be comparable with those obtained with uniform rigid cylinders. Figure 19, presented earlier, shows their photographs as well as sketches of the two near-wake vortex patterns responsible for the hysteresis loop ( $V_{rb} = 0.93$ ,  $Re = 7,350$ ) when the cable is at  $y = -A$ . The upper half shows the **2P** mode at  $A/D = 0.40$  and the lower half the **2S** mode at  $A/D = 0.27$ . According to Fig. 18,  $V_r = 5.84$  ( $V_{rb} = 0.93$ ) does not intersect the critical curve and the vortex shedding mode should be 2P for both cases. However, the large differences in the Reynolds numbers used by WR (1988) and BL (1993), amplitude variations along the cable used by Brika and Laneville, and the small or large increments or decrements of velocity imposed on the ambient flow, or the release of the cable from a pre-excited state may lead to different wake states. It appears that **2P**→**2S** mode jump is most sensitive to hysteresis, as intimated by BL (1993). This may, in part, be because the **2P** mode is the most precarious, and the **2S** mode is the most robust of all the known modes.

Clearly, many ways exist (some yet **untried**) to lead a **body** to excitation with unimaginable jumps and hysteretic behavior, even without the effect of neighboring



bodies (multiple tubes or cables). These may exhibit distinctly different excited modal shapes and hysteresis. The foregoing confirms the fact that the dynamics of the wake is very responsive to changes imposed on the kinematics of the flow and the fact that  $(D/U_o^2)(dU/dt)$  must be quantified during both the acceleration and deceleration periods for one to understand the effect of the rate of change of velocity on the inception of the transient states in both the numerical and physical experiments. Only then can one go beyond the identification of the vortex positions and types of shedding for a given experiment to further the state of the art toward prediction.

BL (1993) compared their work with the contributions of Feng (1968) and Bishop and Hassan (1964), as shown in Fig. 24. The similarities as well as differences (the synchronization and hysteresis covered by the velocity range, jumps in phase) between the three studies are probably due to the differences in  $A/D$ ,  $Re$ , mass parameter, damping, the test bodies (cable and rigid cylinders), end conditions, and the Schewe parameters. These need not be discussed here in further detail.

Hover et al. (1997) pioneered a force-feedback model (FFM) for use in a laboratory environment. FFM allows




Fig. 24. Comparison of Brika & Laneville's data (1993) with those of Feng (1968) and Bishop & Hassan (1964). For symbols see Fig. 23 and Brika & Laneville (1993).

modeling of complex structural dynamics, while fully accounting for the fluid-structure interaction. This is particularly significant since vortex induced vibrations of cables and pipes alter the static configuration and induce additional, static and large dynamic loads. The force-feedback scheme can address a range of free-vibration states, including multiple modes, travelling waves, and other nonlinearities. The use of FFM in industrial applications requires the development of appropriate hydrodynamic models. However, FFM's ability to help to sort out the differences between the single- and multi-mode cases and to understand the additional mechanisms that help to organize the wake (and possibly modify the correlation length and the mode transitions, Hover et al., 2002) throws additional light on the intrinsic nature of VIV.

**KW (1999)** and **GW (2000)** experiments with elastically mounted rigid cylinders at relatively small Reynolds numbers (increasing with  $V_r$  from about 2,000 to **10,000**). Their results are briefly summarized below.

(a) There are two distinct types of system responses, depending on whether the combined mass-damping parameter ( $m^*\zeta$ ) is high or low;

(b) At high  $m^*\zeta$  (e.g., 0.255), there are only two branches: an 'Initial excitation branch' (or, a combined Initial-Upper branch), which yields the maximum amplitude for the case under consideration depicted in Figs. 1 (triangles) and 2 (diamants), and a 'Lower Branch', encountered in earlier experiments (Feng, 1968; Brika and Laneville, 1993; Saltara et al., 1998; Pesce and Fugarra, 2000). The 'Initial and 'Lower' branch are separated by a continuous mode transition. At low  $m^*\zeta$  (e.g., 0.013), there are three branches, as seen in Fig. 2 (black symbols): an 'initial branch' which no longer yields the maximum amplitude, an 'upper branch' which now yields the highest amplitude (both in the region where  $Re < 5,000$ ), and a 'lower branch' which exhibits better periodicity.

(c) It has been shown by a number of investigators (Hover et al., 1998; Brika and Laneville, 1993; GW, 2000) that the 2S mode occurs in the initial (quasi-periodic) and the in initial (periodic) regions. The shedding mode changes to 2P in both the Upper and Lower branches. However, the two vortices of each pair in the Upper branch have quite unequal strengths whereas they are of about equal strength in the

Lower branch. Finally, the initial  $\leftrightarrow$  upper branch transition is hysteretic, but the upper  $\leftrightarrow$  lower transition exhibits intermitting switching. The switch in the timing of vortex shedding is coincident with the phase jump ( $\phi_{total}$ ).

The maximum lift (rms) occurs at the transition between the Initial excitation and the Upper branch. It is indeed very low in the lower branch. It is often stated that the phase angle in the subject transition “remains at just above  $0^\circ$ ” (KW, 1999). Clearly, the said phase angle must be greater than zero in order for the lift coefficient to remain finite according to our Eq. (14).

(d) GW (2000) claimed that “the range of synchronization is controlled primarily by  $m^*$  (when  $m^*\zeta$  is constant), whereas the peak amplitudes are controlled principally by the product of  $m^*\zeta$ .” This claim does not refute the long-standing concerns of Sarpkaya (1978, 1979) and Zdravkovich (1990) regarding the use of such a combined mass-damping parameter at low-mass ratios.

(e) GW (2000) have shown, for two values of  $m^*$  (1.19 and 8.63) or  $(m^* + C_A)\zeta$  (0.0110 and 0.0145), that the Lower-branch regimes collapse well when plotted against  $f_{st}/f_{ex}$ . Furthermore, the amplitude and the region of synchronization correlate with  $U/Df_{com}$  for a constant value of small  $m^*\zeta$  (0.014, 0.017, 0.019). These empirical correlations need to be confirmed at much Reynolds higher numbers with other sets of  $m^*\zeta$  for small, intermediate, and large values of  $m^*\zeta$ .

(f) Finally, as noted earlier, KW (1999) and, subsequently, GW (2000) have introduced a frequency ratio  $f^* = [(m^* + C_A)/(m^* + C_a)]^{1/2}$  where “ $C_a$  is an ‘effective’ added-mass coefficient that includes an apparent effect due to the total transverse fluid force in phase with the body acceleration,” i.e.,  $C_a$  is the **added mass coefficient**, as defined in this paper. In fact,  $f^*$  is nothing more than the ratio of the oscillation frequency, based on the unknown ‘prevailing’ virtual mass, to the ‘in still-water frequency,’ obtained from pluck tests, i.e.,  $C_A = 1$ . Thus, contrary to their assertion,  $f^*$  is not based on the equations of motion. Furthermore, numerical solutions of the ‘exact’ equations of motion do not need, do not depend on, and do not give rise to such arbitrary combinations of in-still-water virtual mass  $(m^* + C_A)$  and the actual virtual mass  $(m^* + C_a)$ . Nevertheless,  $f^*$  has been used in the past and gives an indication of the motion in both forced and free vibration experiments. However,

more recent experience has shown that the use of other frequency ratios (e.g.,  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$ ,  $f_{ex}/f_{vac}$ ) are preferable and in line with those used in numerical simulations.

The use of the above frequency ratio and experiments with  $m^* = 1.19, 2.22$ , and  $8.63$  led KW (1999) and GW (2000) to conclude that “ $C_a$  is a constant along the lower branch” and “it has the same constant value for all other  $m^*$ ”, and “ $C_a = -0.54 \pm 0.02$ ”. It is very important to note that they have assumed mass-damping ( $m^* \zeta$ ) to be small. They have noted that “our deduced value for  $C_a$  is consistent with results from forced oscillations by Gopalkrishnan (1993), where he finds  $C_a \approx -0.60$  in a large region of the ( $A/D$  versus  $f_{st}/f_{ex}$ ) plane, encompassing the complete domain of the lower branch.” This is not quite true. In KW’s (1999) and GW’s (2000) experiments the start of the lower branch is at  $f_{ex}/f_{st} = 0.87$  and the end is at  $f_{ex}/f_{st} = 0.54$ . In terms of Gopalkrishnan’s nondimensional frequency ( $f_{ex}D/U$ ), the said limits are at  $0.104$  and  $0.160$ . It should be noted that the critical phase change in Gopalkrishnan’s experiments occurs at  $f_{ex}/f_{st} = 0.83$  and not at  $0.87$ . In any case, the fact is that in the range of the limits of the Lower branch,  $C_a$  in Gopalkrishnan’s plot (his original Figure 3.16) rises from  $-0.3$  to  $-0.6$  as  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$  decreases from  $0.83$  to  $0.70$  and remains thereafter nearly constant at  $-0.60$  for  $A/D \leq 0.6$ . For larger values of  $A/D$ ,  $C_a$  is limited by  $-0.30$  on either side of the boundaries of the Lower branch. The important fact is that  $C_a$  is not a constant and depends on  $A/D$  and all other parameters that determine  $A/D$ . Notwithstanding these facts, one must note that Gopalkrishnan’s added mass data is rather sketchy. Sarpkaya (1978) presented detailed drag and added mass coefficients obtained by using forced oscillations. His  $C_a$  data are reproduced here as Fig. 25 where




Fig. 25. Variation of the inertia coefficient  $C_a$  (in-phase component of the transverse force) with  $V_r = U/f_{ex}D$  for representative values of  $A/D$  (from Sarpkaya 1978,  $V_r$  is multiplied by  $1.13$  to match the Strouhal numbers at critical transitions).

the original  $U/f_{ex}D$  axis or  $V_r$  is multiplied by 1.13 to match the Strouhal numbers at critical transitions. Thus, it is necessary to carry out detailed experiments by maintaining  $m^*$  constant (at a relatively small value) and by systematically increasing or decreasing the damping and hence the amplitude to investigate whether one would obtain  $C_a$  values higher or lower than -0.54.

Triantafyllou, Techet, Hover, Yue (2003) have carried out experiments with a single rigid cylinder (1-DOF) and a single flexible cylinder (pinned beam, 2-DOF) at the 2-DOF-Carriage research facility of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, hereafter referred to as MIT. The experimental conditions were as follows:  $Re = 3 \times 10^4$ , Aspect ratio = 26,  $m^* = 3.0$ , and  $\zeta = 0.035$ , and  $m^*\zeta = 0.105$ . The results are shown in Fig. 26. The amplitude  $A/D$  (1/10-th highest average, treating the response as a random process) of the 1-DOF rigid cylinder reaches a maximum just a little over 1.0 at  $V_r \approx 5.6$  and reduces to very small values after  $V_r \approx 11$ . What is perhaps most important is the absence, rather than the presence, of some observations made at lower Reynolds numbers with low  $m^*\zeta$ : a hysteretic jump from the Initial excitation branch to the Upper branch (as in Fig. 2). In fact, the variation of  $A/D$ , in Fig. 26(a),




Fig. 26 (a) One degree of freedom rigid cylinder ( $Re = 30,000$ ,  $L/D = 26$ ,  $m^* = 3.0$ ,  $\zeta = 0.035$ , and  $m^*\zeta = 0.105$ ). The amplitude  $A/D$  (1/10-th highest average) reaches a maximum just a little over 1.0 at  $V_r \approx 5.6$ . There is no upper branch, but only a smooth increase in  $A/D$ ; (b) a flexible cylinder (a pinned beam with 2-DOF) exhibits essentially the same overall behavior. However, the position of the maximum  $A/D$  is shifted to larger  $V_r$  (about 7) and to larger  $ND$  (about 1.5); (c) the maximums of the in-line and transverse motion trajectories do not occur simultaneously, the former precedes the latter, see also the forces in 26(b). (Triantafyllou, Techet, Hover, and Yue, 2003).

from its inception to its maximum proceeds rather smoothly. This may be either due to the fact that in Triantafyllou, et al's (2003) experiments  $m^*\zeta$  ( $=0.105$ ) is not small enough or the Reynolds number in GW's (2000) experiments is not high enough for the Gerrard-Bloor transition waves in the free shear layers to disappear and the shear layer transition to reach its maximum upstream temporal mean position. In other words, the initial branches observed at low  $m^*\zeta$  and at low Re may be a consequence of incomplete transition in the shear layers or, in other words, a low-Reynolds number effect. Experiments are needed with  $m^*\zeta < 0.01$  where the minimum Re at  $V_r = 3$  is larger than about 15,000 to resolve the existence or absence of various regimes in the  $A/D$  versus  $V_r$  plot at industrially significant Reynolds numbers.

Figure 26(b), for the flexible cylinder (a pinned beam with 2-DOF) shows essentially the same overall behavior as that for the rigid cylinder as far as the absence of various 'branches' are concerned. However, the position of the maximum  $A/D$  is shifted to larger  $V_r$  (about 7) and to larger  $A/D$  (about 1.5). This is in conformity with the data shown in Fig. 15 (our two-degrees of freedom experiments). Figure 26 reinforces the fact that the results obtained at relatively small Reynolds numbers (say, less than about 6,000) should not be generalized to Reynolds numbers larger than about  $15 \times 10^3$  to  $20 \times 10^3$ . Figure 26(c) shows the motion trajectories of the flexible cylinder. It is evident from the in-line force coefficient as well from Fig. 26(c) that the largest excursions in the drag direction occur at  $V_r \approx 5.5$ , not at  $V_r \approx 7$  where the maximum amplitudes occur in the transverse direction. Clearly, the maximums of the in-line and transverse oscillations do not occur simultaneously, as seen in Figs. 26(b) and (c), the former precedes the latter. *Also* the larger in-line amplitudes in the range of  $4 < V_r < 6$  suggest improved and sustained correlation conducive to in-line forces.

## 12. VIV at high Re: facts, extrapolations, and conjectures

In the foregoing, we have presented mostly experimental facts in the range of Reynolds numbers from about 500 to  $6 \times 10^4$ . These were obtained through small and medium-scale laboratory experiments under controlled conditions. Many relevant parameters such as the correlation length, pressure distribution, separation points, etc. were not measured and/or reported.

Experiments with forced and self-excited cylinders in non-sheared flows have shown that the amplitude ratio  $A/D$ , the phase angle  $\phi$ , and the in-phase and out-of-phase components of the lift force depend (mostly) on the reduced velocity  $V_r$  or its various versions. These parameters are needed for the iterative design of relatively simple cables or pipes subjected to uniform flows.

However, the ocean environment is considerably more complex: lack of data, sufficient insight, and practical experience on the Occurrence of VIV at critical to super-critical Reynolds numbers in omni-directional waves and currents, uniform and/or non-uniform shear, stratification, ambient turbulence, with various types of excrescencies and possible multi-modal response of structures, force the designers to continue to use relatively high safety factors. The matter is further complicated by the fact that data obtained either in the large basins around the world or in the oceans by the industry are often case-specific and proprietary. The wide dissemination of the existing Ocean data would have helped to resolve many of the issues cited above for the betterment of all concerned. We do not hope to change the existing operational culture of the industrial organizations, however, we are grateful to a few who shared some information with us during the past year *so* that we could glean some facts from them.

As we have noted previously, in connection with the discussion of the “Governing and influencing parameters,” Humphries and Walker (1988, hereafter referred to as HW) carried out extensive experiments with a cylinder ( $D=0.168$  m,  $L/D=33$ , with ‘smooth external finish’,  $m^*=1.98$ ,  $\zeta=0.0143$ ,  $m^*\zeta=0.0283$ , and  $f_{wtr}=1.23$  Hz) in a deep flume in the range of Reynolds numbers from about 50,000 to  $4 \times 10^5$  in both the nominally uniform flow,  $(U_{max}/U_{min})=1:1$ , and in linear (positive) shear with 1:1.5, 1:2, and 1:3, with the corresponding shear parameters of 0.0, 0.012, 0.02, and 0.03, respectively. The cylinder was effectively a “pinned-pinned” beam. As they have noted, “The top end of the ‘pin’ mounting was connected to a hydraulic ram to allow vertical movements as the vertical cylinder flexed. This prevented the introduction of axial tension, and hence changes in natural frequency, due to the model deflection.”

The results of (HW, 1988) are shown in Figs. 27 and 28 for the global drag coefficient and the cross-flow amplitude response, respectively. Figure 27 shows that the drag coefficient for the uniform flow ( $U_{max}/U_{min}=1:1$ ) is dramatically




Fig. 27. (a) The nature of the variation of  $C_d$  is like that of a smooth cylinder entering the critical transition, with  $C_d$  dropping sharply. The VIV (with 2-DOF) first arrests the drop in  $C_d$  and then increases it sharply, proving that VIV occurred within the zone of critical transition. The drag for the uniform flow ( $U_{max}/U_{min} = 1:1$ ) is dramatically amplified with respect to the rigid cylinder (at rest). As to the effects of shear, the maximums of  $C_d$  decrease with increasing shear and occur at smaller  $U_{ref}/f_{wtr}D$  (Humphries and Walker, 1988).

amplified with respect to the rigid cylinder (at rest) and that VIV in uniform flow produces the largest drag (after an initial anticipated sharp drop) in the critical regime.

The nature of the variation of  $C_d$  is very much like that of a cylinder entering the critical transition, with  $C_d$  dropping sharply. However, when the lock-in occurs (with 2-DOF)  $C_d$  increases sharply, proving that VIV occurred within the zone of critical transition. Furthermore, even in the critical Re region, the occurrence of maximum  $C_d$  (at about  $U_{ref}/f_{wtr}D$




Fig. 28. The maximum  $A/D$  for the no-shear case (about 1.5 at  $U_{ref}/f_{wtr}D = 6.2$ ) corresponds quite well with that in Fig. 26 (about 1.5 at  $U_{ref}/f_{wtr}D \approx 7$ ). With shear, the maximums of  $A/D$  occur with reduced peaks at smaller  $U_{ref}/f_{wtr}D$  and decrease towards unity. It appears that shear extends the range of the lock-in region. Even in the critical Re region, the occurrence of maximum  $C_d$  (at about  $U_{ref}/f_{wtr}D \approx 5.6$ ) precedes the occurrence of maximum  $A/D$  (at  $U_{ref}/f_{wtr}D \approx 6.2$ ), as in Figs. 26(a) and (b) for the sub-critical flow (Humphries and Walker, 1988).



$\approx 5.6$ ) in Fig. 27 precedes the occurrence of maximum  $A/D$  (at  $U_{ref}/f_{wtr}D \approx 6.2$ ) in Fig. 28, as in the case shown in Figs. 26(a) and (b), for a sub-critical flow. Furthermore, the maximum  $A/D$  for the no-shear data (about 1.5 at  $U_{ref}/f_{wtr}D \approx 6.2$ ) corresponds quite well with that in Fig. 26-b (about 1.5 at  $U_{ref}/f_{wtr}D \approx 7$ ). As to the effect of shear, the data under consideration clearly show that  $C_d$  decreases with increasing shear and the lock-in occurs with smaller peaks at smaller  $U_{ref}/f_{wtr}D$ . Likewise,  $A/D$  maximums decrease toward unity. It is further noted that shear extends the range of the lock-in region. However, these observations and the results shown in Figs. 27 and 28 are of a global nature only since they are based on the reference velocity at mid-span. With higher shear, the character of the flow (super-critical flow, high intensity turbulence) at the top of the pipe may be significantly different from that at the bottom (subcritical flow, lower turbulence), and there is no simple way to average out or to explain the difficult-to-quantify Occurrences and transitions along the pipe. In spite of all these, shear should not necessarily instill a 'fear of the unknown' in most designs.

A method for predicting approximately the static and lift responses of a flexible cylinder in a unidirectional sheared current was outlined by Patrikalakis and Chrysostomidis (1986). Their approach, based on the experimental data obtained by Sarpkaya (1978), represents the multifrequency lift response of a flexible cylinder in a sheared current by predicting a number of independently determined, monochromatic, multimode dynamic solutions. A numerical example assuming bimodal solutions is included to illustrate the method for the geometry of a single-tube marine riser.

A numerical simulation tool was developed by Dalheim (1999) at Det Norske Veritas for the prediction of VIV of flexible risers in sheared currents with some promising results. The studies of large-scale model testing of deep sea risers (90 m long) in a shear current (Huse et al. 1998) have produced a number of important results: (a) vortex induced vibrations may cause resonant *axial* vibrations in a deep-sea steel riser whether it is pinned at both ends or free at one end and pinned at the other; (b) such axial vibrations may lead to excessive stresses in the risers, significantly larger than the bending fatigue stresses normally **considered to be** the main problem of VIV; and (c) reducing or eliminating the lateral as well as the axial

excitation by employing the most suitable VIV suppression devices goes a long way toward reducing the high axial stresses.

It is evident from the foregoing that the end conditions of the test pipe, that is, the freedom allowed to the ends to move cyclically in the axial direction, emerges as an important parameter, particularly in the field tests. If both ends of a pipe (say, pinned-pinned) are constrained to extensional motion, the  $A/D$  will be smaller than if one or both ends were free to move in the axial direction, as in the case of tests by Humphries and Walker (1988). In a long pipeline, every span is elastically connected to each other. This serves as a strong damper and increases the stiffness of the line, which, in turn, reduces the amplitude of VIV. The amount of reduction in  $A/D$  is not, however, easy to quantify because of its dependence on several other parameters (e.g.,  $m^*$ ,  $\zeta$ ,  $L_{span}/D$ , stiffness, shearing strains, temperature and its gradients, friction, time-dependent roughness, etc.). It is also clear from the foregoing, as well as from other sources, that high-Re data are not significantly different from those seen at sub-critical Reynolds numbers above 20,000.

Bruschi, Buresti, Castoldi, and Migliavacca (1982) described two experimental investigations at high Reynolds numbers. The first was conducted in a wind tunnel with a model cylinder to quantify the wall-proximity effects. The second was carried out with a full-scale pipeline span (with various types of roughness) immersed in a tidal current ( $1.7 < Re < 2.2 \times 10^5$ ). Bruschi et al. (1982) have not presented any graphical or numerical results but made the following observations: (a) the oscillations at the center of the span reached  $0.8D$  at  $Re = 1.7 \times 10^5$  for a pipe of  $D = 0.15$  m, and  $A = 2D$  at  $Re = 2.4 \times 10^5$  for a pipe of  $D = 0.51$  m; and (b) the flow at the lower Re was in the critical transition region and at the upper Re was in the supercritical region. They have conducted engineering tests with helical ropes and other 'damping' devices.

Allen and Henning (1997) performed experiments with two flexible as well as non-flexible circular cylinders in the critical/supercritical Reynolds number range ( $D_1 \approx 0.088$  m,  $k/D_1 = 1.37 \times 10^{-4}$ , in the Re range of  $2 \times 10^5 < Re < 6 \times 10^5$ ; and  $D_2 \approx 0.14$  m,  $k/D_2 = 9.94 \times 10^{-5}$ , in the Re range of  $6 \times 10^5 < Re < 1.5 \times 10^6$ ). Varying degrees of difficulties were encountered with the end conditions, alignments, Froude numbers exceeding unity (in the test basin) and the duration of the data-acquisition period.

Their stationary non-flexible-cylinder experiments tended to agree with the well-known results of Roshko (1961), Schewe (1983), and Shih et al. (1992) at similar  $k/D$  values. The results have once again illustrated the fact that the case of a smooth cylinder is a pathological case and the lightly roughened cylinder becomes the canonical bluff body, particularly at supercritical Reynolds numbers, for both stationary and vibrating cylinders.

For the smaller cylinder undergoing VIV, the drag coefficient decreased from about 1.2 to 0.6, the in-line RMS displacement remained nearly constant at about  $A/D = 0.1$ , and the amplitude of the transverse oscillations leveled off at  $A/D = 0.4$  for  $Re$  larger than about  $3.2 \times 10^5$ . For the larger cylinder undergoing VIV, the drag coefficient increased from **0.45** (at  $Re = 7 \times 10^5$ ) to a maximum of 0.7 (at  $Re = 1.3 \times 10^6$ ) and then decreased to about 0.6 at  $Re = 1.5 \times 10^6$ . The in-line RMS displacement remained nearly constant at about  $A/D = 0.05$ , except at a single point ( $Re = 1.05 \times 10^6$ ) at which it jumped to about 0.13. It was not clear whether this singular event was a Reynolds number effect or, more likely, the effect of the Froude number exceeding unity. The RMS amplitude of the transverse oscillations increased almost linearly from zero (at  $Re = 7 \times 10^5$ ) to  $A/D = 0.44$  (at  $Re = 1.3 \times 10^6$ ) and then decreased linearly to about 0.3 at the highest Reynolds number encountered ( $Re = 1.5 \times 10^6$ ).

Our numerous conversations with enlightened representatives of several large petroleum concerns have helped us to deduce the following tentative conclusions, which will be presented here without empirical verification proof (i.e., caveat emptor!):

1. It is a well-known fact that as the Reynolds number increases from about 400,000 to about one million, the Strouhal number is undefinable for a steady flow past a 'smooth' cylinder. However, for a cylinder subjected to VIV, *the Strouhal number becomes definable in the said  $Re$  range and smoothly transitions from about 0.18 to 0.24*, due to the enhanced correlation. The wake width decreases from about  $D$  to  $0.7 D$ , and the drag coefficient decreases accordingly.

2. The limited data show that the case of a "smooth" cylinder is a pathological case and the lightly roughened cylinder becomes the canonical bluff body at high

Reynolds numbers (see, e.g., Achenbach, 1971; Schewe, 1983; Shih et al., 1992; Okajima et al. 1999). Cylinders of relatively small roughness exhibit relatively small  $A/D$  in the usual range of reduced velocities. However, with a roughness of about 1-mm (for instance, over a cylinder of one foot in diameter), one may expect a maximum  $A/D$  ratio of about 0.95. The same cylinder subjected to forced oscillations yields results very similar to those obtained with self-excited oscillations. The foregoing results are mostly for cylinders constrained in the in-line direction.

3. Experiments with 2-DOF (both in-line and transverse oscillations) at very high Reynolds numbers show that the results are indeed nearly identical to those reported by Sarpkaya (1995), (see Fig. 15), as we have noted earlier. The 2-DOF case produced 10 to 20 percent larger  $A/D$  values reaching about  $A/D = 1$  over a wider range of reduced velocities (from about 4 to 13). The maximum  $A/D$  values occur in the range of reduced velocities from 8 to 10. In the case of the constrained or 1-DOF cylinders, the maximum  $A/D$  is somewhat smaller (about **0.85**) in the range of reduced velocities from about 5 to 6, as would be expected. These results require further confirmation, hopefully, in the very near future.

4. The effect of shear is more difficult to account for in terms of various transitions and axial variations in the flow states. However, the experiments of Humphries and Walker (1988) provide strong guidance for design. Currently, strip theory, based on forced cylinder data and correlation models, is used in spite of its obvious shortcomings (e.g., phase and amplitude differences between the segments, directional changes in velocity and/or shear).

5. None of the high Reynolds number experiments ( $Re > 20,000$ ) show such phenomena as "initial branch" (seen only at Reynolds numbers less than about 5,000). The vortex modes of 2P, 2S, and others have been mapped only at Reynolds numbers below 1,000. As we have noted earlier a number of times, the shear layers do not become unstable for  $Re < 1,300$  and the mean position of the line of transition to turbulence does not reach upstream enough for  $Re$  less than about  $15 \times 10^3$  to  $20 \times 10^3$ .

6. **In free oscillations at sufficiently large  $Re$** , the oscillations are not sinusoidal, as evidenced by many experiments and numerical simulations. Consequently, the

flow does not become fully established, say "periodic," because the amplitude, added-mass, frequency, phase angle, vortex structures, shear layers never become fully established. Each cycle is affected by the character of the previous cycle. Consequently, the ever-changing topology of the flow prevents it from exhibiting sharp changes (as branches) in the  $A/D$  versus  $V_r$  plots at high Re.

7. It may be stated with little reservation that high-Re data ( $A/D$  and force-transfer coefficients, such as lift and added-mass) with smooth and reasonably-roughened, non-tapered cylinders exhibit essentially the same results as those the research community has produced in the laboratories during the past 15 years in the range of Reynolds numbers from about 20,000 to 60,000 (except, as noted above, with regard to the smooth transition in Strouhal numbers and drag coefficients in the critical to supercritical regimes). Thus the issue is not the discovery of great surprises at high Re, but rather how to refine the high Re data to reduce the error to less than 10%, how to deal better with shear, how to quantify and to translate the effects of the end conditions (axial motion) for single-span laboratory experiments versus continuous pipes, how to account for and quantify multi-modes and mode interference, how to suppress VIV at any Re, and how to reduce the safety factors.

8. In recent years, more and more investigators have turned towards research in the thinner and thinner stream of discoverable knowledge. This created a wide gap between the solution of far more complex industrially significant VIV problems and the data obtained at photographable Reynolds numbers. The extensive application of VIV to PIV has resulted in large volumes of colorized vortices, often with intangible returns at critical and transitional Reynolds numbers.

9. The wide dissemination of the large-scale data will improve their interpretation and the planning of future experiments. It will also enrich the science and technology of VIV and help to resolve many of the issues cited above for the betterment of all concerned.

### **13. Numerical simulations**

The numerical simulation of flow past a circular cylinder undergoing VIV at relatively small Reynolds numbers (particularly in the range  $Re = 100-1000$ ) is

complicated by some of the most complex problems of fluid mechanics such as separation excursions, incomplete transition in the shear layers, and the coherence length based on a yet unexplained coupling mechanism between the dynamics of the near-wake and that of the structure. Most of the disparity between the experiments and numerical simulations is attributable to the fact the mean position of the line of transition to turbulence does not reach upstream enough for  $Re$  less than about 15,000 to 20,000, even though VIV with two-degrees of freedom may precipitate the instability somewhat sooner.

Many models of **turbulence**, for every occasion, are described in numerous texts. However, DNS does not require ‘modeling.’ It deals **only** and purely with the numerical problem of solving the time-dependent Navier-Stokes equations, albeit at relatively small Reynolds numbers. Large Eddy Simulation (LES) appeared to be a compromise. However, as Grinstein and Karniadakis (2002) noted recently: “After more than 30 years of intense research on large-eddy simulations (LES) of turbulent flows based on eddy-viscosity subfilter models, (Deardroff, 1970), there is now consensus that such an approach is subject to fundamental limitations. It has been demonstrated for a number of different flows that the shear stress and strain tensors involved in subfilter eddy-viscosity models have different topological features rendering scalar eddy-viscosity models inaccurate.”

Other computational methods include the discrete-vortex method (DVM), the use of RANS, or the combination of a number of them. We will not dwell on simulations at Reynolds numbers smaller than 1,000. They may be of interest in assessing a given numerical scheme at a given  $Re$ , but not necessarily to predict VIV at more realistic Reynolds numbers.

The discrete vortex model was first used by Sarpkaya and Shoaff (1979) with reasonable success after judicious selection of the controlling parameters (Sarpkaya, 1989, **1994**). Meneghini et al. (2002) used DVM to calculate the behavior of cylinders ( $m^* = 3.3$ ,  $m^* \zeta = 0.013$ , and  $L/D = 94.5, 480, \mathbf{4,600}$ ) subjected to currents and shear ( $Re = 10,000$ ). Their simulation did not capture the ‘Upper branch,’ related to the maximum amplitudes. The case of a cantilever yielded similar results. Their single riser simulations provided the expected vibration modes and the comparisons with the quasi-steady analysis were quite encouraging.




Fig. 29. A 2-D finite volume analysis in conjunction with RANS equations and a  $K-\omega$  model for turbulence to simulate the 1-DOF response of a cylinder in the range of Re from 900 to 15,000 with  $m^* = 2.4$  and  $m^*\zeta \approx 0.013$ . Three initial conditions were used: cylinder starting from a state of rest, increasing velocity, and decreasing velocity. For the conditions of 'from the rest' and 'decreasing velocity' only the lower branch was predicted. With 'increasing' velocity, on the other hand, the maximum amplitude corresponded to the experimental value, but the upper branch did not match the experiments. (Guilmineau and Queutey, 2001).

Evangelinos and Karniadakis (1999) and, subsequently, Evangelinos et al. (2000); Lucor and Karniadakis (2002), and the references cited therein, dealt with the predictability and uncertainty in flow-structure interactions and with the dynamics of flow structures in the wake of rigid and flexible cylinders subjected to VIV. Recently, Lucor et al. (2003) extended their DNS model to  $Re = 3000$  (by increasing the lateral spacing of the mesh size), but not without some difficulties. Guilmineau and Queutey (2001) used a 2-D finite volume analysis in conjunction with RANS and a  $K-\omega$  model for turbulence to simulate the 1-DOF response of a cylinder in the range of Re from 900 to  $15 \times 10^3$  and compared their predictions with those of KW (1999) at  $Re \approx 3700$ . Three initial conditions were used in the simulations: a cylinder starting from a state of rest, increasing velocity, and decreasing velocity. For the conditions of 'from the rest' and 'decreasing velocity' they have predicted only the lower branch. With 'increasing' velocity, on the other hand, the maximum amplitude corresponded to the experimental value, but the upper branch did not match the experiments (Fig. 29). The use of a fully developed turbulence model, ( $K-\omega$ ) for a 2-D finite volume analysis, in the range of *transitional* Reynolds numbers (for the shear layers) makes it difficult to discern the reasons for the differences between the experiments and their numerical simulations.

Notwithstanding the concerns expressed by Grinstein and Karniadakis (2002), LES has been used by a number of investigators. Saltara et al. (1998) used DVM and

LES for a 1-DOF VIV at  $Re = 1000$ . Tutar and Holdo (2000) used LES in conjunction with the finite element method at  $Re=2.4 \times 10^4$  for a cylinder subjected to forced oscillations and found that 3-D representation was necessary to obtain accurate enough results. This follows from the fact that 2-D representations naturally yield perfect correlations. The VIV enhances the correlation but it does not make it perfect.

As we have noted earlier, the degree of correlation, related to all other parameters, plays a major role in all aspects of VIV. As noted by Al-Jamal and Dalton (2002), “An LES model, either 2-D or 3-D, is not capable of calculating the full flow past a stationary cylinder, much less an oscillating one.” DNS is Re-limited for the foreseeable future. Thus, all one can hope for is the prediction of some aspects of VIV through the use of RANS and suitable turbulence models under the safeguarding as well as safeguarding eyes of high-quality experiments in all ranges of Reynolds number.

Zhang and Dalton (1996) performed a 2-D LES study for a transversely oscillating cylinder at  $Re=13,000$ . Their results exhibited the same trends as the experimental results of Feng (1968). Lu and Dalton (1996) examined the VIV problem for a 2-D viscous flow at  $Re = 200$  and 2-D turbulent flow at  $Re = 855$ . They found good agreement with the results of Ongoren and Rockwell (1988a, b) and reasonably good agreement with the results of Lecointe and Piquet (1989). However, the lift calculations of Lecointe and Piquet were about 35% larger at  $Re = 855$  than those of Zhang and Dalton because they had not used a turbulence model. More recently, Al-Jamal and Dalton (2002) have performed 2-D LES calculations of the self-excited response of a cylinder at  $Re = 8,000$  for a range of damping ratios and natural frequencies. In spite of the shortcomings of a 2-D simplification, their results predicted the expected vibratory response in the range  $0.72 < f_{com}/f_{st} < 1.26$ . Decreasing material damping increased the lock-in range. A beating behavior was observed in the oscillations, which decreased with increasing damping (see Fig. 9). Clearly, one does not expect the 2-D LES to represent the inception and growth of the instabilities accurately, let alone the transition to turbulence, in unsteady shear layers. It appears that the question of the 3-D numerical simulation of VIV even for a smooth circular cylinder in the range of Reynolds numbers from a few thousand to over a million will remain unresolved indefinitely. Higher order modes caused by secondary



instabilities resulting from the changes in phase and amplitude in self-excited oscillations will certainly complicate the simulations with any turbulence model in any indirect numerical simulation. However, large-scale benchmark experiments at large Reynolds numbers coupled with 3-D numerical simulations using RANS, or the Favre-averaged (1965) Navier-Stokes equations (**FANS**), employing several turbulence models, may allow one to develop industrial codes that may be used (after many calibrations) for design purposes in small domains of the controlling parameters.

#### 14. Conclusions and recommendations

The modest objective of this paper has been to review the vortex-induced vibrations in a few specific fundamental cases, as we did in 1979. However, the difficulty of this review has been materially increased by the enormous growth of the size and number of conferences and publications during the past 25 years. Those who desire a more comprehensive or utilitarian treatment of VIV will find the references cited in the text and hundreds of other papers which appeared in the proceedings of numerous conferences, to be most helpful. Obviously, much remains to be done, and we will record here only a few cautious suggestions for consideration, rather than a competent glance into the future:

1. Carry out intricate experiments in the range of Re from about 3,000 to 50,000 on the evolution of instability on unsteady shear layers emanating from a rigid cylinder undergoing synchronized (free/forced) oscillations.

As noted in the 'Introduction,' Reynolds number in our on-going experiments is kept constant at a specified value by maintaining  $U$ ,  $O$ ,  $L/D$ ,  $k$ ,  $\zeta$ ,  $\rho_f$  and  $\nu$  constant and varying only  $m$  in  $\rho_m = 4m/(\pi L D^2)$  in small increments and hence  $f_{vac}$  in  $V_r = U/f_{vac}D$  or in  $f_{ex}/f_{vac}$ . Subsequently, Re is changed to a new value for a new set of experiments with varying  $m$ . The data will define a 3-D space showing  $A/D$  versus  $f_{ex}/f_{vac}$  in each plane of constant Re. We intend to continue this study with further data inter-comparisons and hope that the results will complement other contributions dealing directly with the evolution of instability on unsteady shear layers and with the DNS, LES, or RANS simulations of VIV at a given Re.

2. Obtain a new set of data (at  $Re > 2 \times 10^4$ ) for all values of  $S_G$  (for rigid cylinders and cables with proper end conditions) using refined methods, instrumentation, and proper damping (in air) partly for practical purposes and partly, and most importantly, for determining the regions and the reasons where  $S_G$  *alone* correlates the data and the regions where  $m^*$  and  $\zeta$  operate as independent parameters. This will help to separate the regions of applicability of the simple linear-motion analysis of VIV, from which the  $S_G$  emanates, from the non-linear range of the system response.

3. Determine the character and magnitude of the self-limiting behavior of VIV of the cylinders and cables at large  $Re$  and  $L/D$  as  $S_G$  approaches zero.

4. Perform a whole new set of careful experiments at  $Re > 20,000$  in a facility without free surface or surfactants (dissolvable or non-dissolvable) to delineate the vortex shedding modes as a function of  $f_{ex}/f_{st}$  in the entire range of synchronization. It has already been emphasized a number of times that the Reynolds number effects in all VIV experiments and numerical simulations remain an unresolved practical as well as fundamental problem of major significance.

5. Perform a numerical simulation of the motion of two parallel shear layers subjected to sinusoidal transverse motion in a uniform steady flow (a la Abernathy and Kronauer, 1962). Even though one may not be able to connect all the links of the chain, the parts that can be connected might provide a better understanding of vortex shedding modes.

6. Systematically investigate (at  $Re > 20,000$ ) the role of the amplitude modulations in free oscillations on the differences between the free and forced oscillations. The rate of increase or decrease of the ambient velocity and the intensity and integral length scale of turbulence must be quantified for each experiment.

7. Find the means (numerically or experimentally) to interfere with the coupling mechanisms between the near-wake dynamics and the structure dynamics to change the phase difference.

8. Control mode: all active and passive means to prevent the wake from shifting to a 2S mode.

9. Introduce additional frequencies into the motion of a flexible body (cable) to cancel some others and diffuse the energy between various frequencies.

10. Produce cables and structures with smart materials (see, e.g., Chopra, 2002 and the references cited therein) that increase their (material) damping when subjected to cyclic motion, stiffen their supports, and reduce the correlation length (interfering with the boundary layers and shear layers).

11. Carry out extensive measurements and numerical simulations to enhance the understanding of the effects of body proximity, vortex shedding from, and VIV of three-dimensional bodies.

12. Perform extensive measurements and numerical simulations to enhance the understanding and prediction of the effect of ambient turbulence on shear layer instability, separation excursions, and VIV.

13. Find more elegant means to suppress VIV and to control (decrease) the correlation length throughout the cycle (ropes are so non-ingenuous).

14. Determine the mutual interaction of low frequency ocean waves, uniform (or sheared) collinear currents and VIV at  $Re > 20,000$  ('young' turbulence at  $Re \cong 1,000$  is commendable, but not enough).

15. Make great strides to enhance the power of computers, numerical methods, and approximate models (the existing as well as new ones) to enhance the prediction of VIV. There are, at present, large  $Re$  gaps between the computable, measurable, and industrially-significant ranges of VIV. Evangelinos et al. (2000) noted that the DNS simulations "are currently prohibitively expensive to be used in the engineering design of VIV." They have also suggested that "the answer could be provided by dynamical systems modeling, given the low dimensionality of the wake." Clearly, the subject will remain exciting for generations to come not only because turbulence remains understood but also because it needs simulations at a level that could be used for industrial design explorations and ingenious VIV suppression devices at any

Re, in any environment. **As** noted earlier, a better way may be developing robust codes based on various versions of RANS or FANS, suitable turbulence models, and benchmark experiments at large Reynolds numbers, and establishing code banks for validation and verification. The results of low-Re VIV experiments (e.g., at Re less than about 6,000) should not be generalized to Reynolds numbers larger than about  $15 \times 10^3$  to  $20 \times 10^3$ .

### **Acknowledgements**

I am indebted to a large number of people on whose work I have so extensively drawn to produce this review. Many colleagues have responded generously to my requests for advice, references, advance copies of papers, reports, and theses, and/or originals of some figures. I am particularly indebted to Professor Charles Dalton, Prof. Geir Moe, Dr. Owen H. Oakley, Professor Michael S. Triantafyllou, Professor J. Kim Vandiver, and Professor Timothy Wei for stimulating discussions, references and encouragement. My heartfelt thanks go to Mrs. Irma L. Fink and Mr. Jeff N. Rothal of the NPS library who did the endless search for references and always managed to find them. My thanks also go to the Cambridge University Press and Elsevier Science Ltd. who permitted reproductions from earlier publications. Support for this work was provided by the Naval Postgraduate School and the Office of Naval Research (ONR contract N00014-02-WR-20109).

## REFERENCES

- Abernathy, F.H., Kronauer, R.E., 1962. The formation of vortex streets. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 13, 1-20.
- Achenbach, E., 1971. Influence of surface roughness on the cross-flow around a circular cylinder. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 46, 321-335.
- Ahmed, N.A., Wagner, D.J., 2003. Vortex shedding and transition frequencies associated with flow around a circular cylinder. *AIJAA Journal* 41(3), 542-544.
- Alexander, C.M., 1981. The complex vibration and implied drag of a long oceanographic wire in cross-flow. *Ocean Engineering* 8(4), 379-406.
- Al-Jamal, H., Dalton, C., 2002. Vortex induced vibrations using large eddy simulation at a moderate Reynolds number. Conference on Bluff Body Wakes and Vortex-Induced Vibrations (BBVIV3), Port Douglas, Australia.
- Al-Jamal, H., Dalton, C., 2003. Vortex induced vibrations using large eddy simulation at a moderate Reynolds number. *Journal of Fluids and Structures* (pending).
- Allen, D.W., Henning, D.L., 1997. Vortex-induced vibration tests of a flexible smooth cylinder at supercritical Reynolds numbers. Proceedings of the 1997 ISOPE Conference, volume 111, Honolulu, 680-685.
- Angrilli, F., Di Silvio, G., Zanardo, A., 1972. Hydroelasticity study of a circular cylinder in a water stream. In Flow Induced Structural Vibrations. In: Naudascher, E. (Ed.), IUTAM-IAHR Symposium, pp. 504-512.
- Atsavapranee, P., Benaroya, H., Wei, T., 1998. Vortex dynamics in the near wake of a freely-oscillating cylinder. Proceedings of the FEDSM'98. ASME Fluids Engineering Division. Summer Meeting, Washington, D.C., pp. 1-6.
- Au-Yang, M.K., 2001. Flow-Induced Vibrations of Power and Process Plant Components – A Practical Workbook. The American Society of Mechanical Engineers, New York, NY.
- Bartran, D., Kinsey, J.M., Schappelle, R., Yee, R., 1999. Flow induced vibration of thermowells. *Journal of The Science and Engineering of Measurement and Automation* 38, 123-132.

Basset, A.B., **1888**. On the motion of a sphere in a viscous liquid. Philosophical Transactions Royal Society of London **179**, **43-63**. (See also a Treatise on Hydrodynamics, **2**, Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co. Also New York, Dover Publications).

Basu, R.I., **1985**. Aerodynamic forces on structures of circular cross sections, part 1. Journal of Wind Engineering Industrial Aerodynamics **21**, **273-294**.

Batchelor, G.K., **1967**. *An Introduction to Fluid Dynamics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, p. **357**.

Bearman, P.W., **1984**. Vortex shedding from oscillating bluff bodies. Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics **16**, **195-222**.

Bearman, P.W., Currie, I.G., **1979**. Pressure fluctuation measurements on an oscillating circular cylinder. Journal of Fluid Mechanics **91**, **661-677**.

Bearman, P.W., Brankovic, M., **2002**. Passive control of vortex-induced vibration. Conference on Bluff Body Wakes and Vortex-Induced Vibrations (**BBVIV3**), **17-20** December, Port Douglas, Australia.

Benjamin, T.B., **1986**. Note on added mass and drift. Journal of Fluid Mechanics **169**, **251-256**.

Berger, E., Wille, R., **1972**. Periodic flow phenomena. Annual Reviews of Fluid Mechanics **4**, **313-340**.

Bishop, R.E.D., Hassan, A.Y., **1964**. The lift and drag forces on a circular cylinder in a flowing fluid. Proceedings of Royal Society of London, Series A **277**, pp. **32-50**, and **51-75**.

Blackburn, H.M., Henderson, R.D., **1999**. A study of two-dimensional flow past an oscillating cylinder. Journal of Fluid Mechanics **385**, **255-286**.

Blackburn, **H.M.**, Govardhan, R.N., Williamson, C.H.K., **2001**. A complementary numerical and physical investigation of vortex-induced vibration. Journal of Fluids and Structures **15**, **481-488**.

Blevins, R.D., **1990**. Flow-Induced Vibration (second ed.). New York, USA. Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Blevins, R.D., **1999**. On vortex-induced fluid forces on oscillating cylinders. Proceedings of the ASME Pressure Vessels and Piping division Publication PVP **389**, pp. **103-111**.

Blevins, **R.D.**, Burton, **T.E.**, **1976**. Fluid forces induced by vortex shedding. Journal of Fluids Engineering **95**, **19-24**.

Bloomfield, P., **2000**. Fourier Analysis of Time Series - **An** Introduction. John Wiley and Sons Inc., Canada.

Bloor, S.M., **1964**. The transition to turbulence in the wake of a circular cylinder. Journal of Fluid Mechanics **19**, **290-309**.

Bloor, S.M., Gerrard, J.H. **1966**. Measurements on turbulent vortices in a cylinder wake. Proceedings of the Royal Society, London, Series A, **294**, pp. **319-342**.

Brika, D., Laneville, **A.**, **1993**. Vortex-induced vibrations of a long flexible circular cylinder. Journal of Fluid Mechanics **250**, **481-508**.

Bruschi, R.M., Buresti, **G.**, Castoldi, A., Migliavacca, E., **1982**. Vortex shedding oscillations for submarine pipelines: Comparison between III-scale experiments and analytical models. Offshore Technology Conference **OTC** Number **4232** May.

Bublitz, P., **1972**. Unsteady pressures and forces acting on an oscillating circular cylinder in transverse flow. Symposium of Flow-Induced Structural Vibrations. Karlsruhe, Germany, **443-453**.

Carberry, J., **2002**. Wake states of a submerged oscillating cylinder and of a cylinder beneath a free-Surface. Ph.D. Thesis, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.

Carberry, J., Sheridan, J., Rockwell, **D.**, **2002**. Controlled Oscillations of a cylinder: Forces and wake modes. (submitted for publication).

Cazemier, W., **1997**. Proper orthogonal decomposition and low dimensional models for turbulent flows. Ph.D. Thesis, Rijksuniversiteit, Groningen, Sweden.

Chen, **S.S.**, **1987**. Flow-Induced Vibration of Circular Cylinder Structures. Hemisphere Publishing Corporation, Springer-Verlag. Washington, **D.C.**, Chapter 7.

Chen, S.S. Jendrzejczyk, J.A., **1979**. Dynamic response of a circular cylinder subjected to liquid cross flow. *Journal of Pressure Vessel Technology* **101**, 106-112.

Cheng, M., Moretti, P.M., **1991**. Lock-in phenomena on a single cylinder with forced transverse oscillation. *Pressure Vessels and Piping, Division of ASME* **206**, In Flow-Induced Vibration and Wear, 129-133.

Chopra, I., **2002**. Review of state of art of smart structures and integrated systems. *AIAA Journal* **40**(11), 2145-2187.

Cohen, K., Siegel, S., McLaughlin, T., Gilles, E., **2003**. Feedback control of a cylinder wake low-dimensional model. *AIAA Journal* **4**(7), 1389-1391.

Darheim, J., **1999**. Numerical prediction of VIV on deepwater risers subjected to shear currents and waves. *Offshore Technology Conference, OTC Number 10933*, Houston, Texas. 3-6 May.

Darwin, Sir Charles, **1953**. Notes on hydrodynamics. *Proceedings of Cambridge Philosophical Society* **49**, pp. 342-354.

Davies, M.E., **1976**. A comparison of the wake structure of a stationary and oscillating bluff body. Using a conditional averaging technique. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **75**, 209-231.

Dean, R.B., Milligan, R.W., Wooton, L.R., **1977**. *An experimental study of flow-induced vibration*. E.E.C. Report 4, Atkins Research and Development, Epsom U.K.

Deardorff, J.W., **1970**. A numerical study of three-dimensional turbulent channel flow at large Reynolds numbers. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **41**(2), 453.

Deep Oil Technology, **1992**. Joint Industry Program on Vortex Induced Motions of Large Floating Platforms, Houston, Tx.

Den Hartog, J.P., **1934**. The vibration problems in engineering. *Proceedings of the 4th International Congress Applied Mechanics Cambridge*, pp. 34-53.

Deniz, S., Staubli, T., **1997**. "Oscillating rectangular and octagonal profiles: interaction of leading- and trailing-edge vortex formation". *Journal of Fluids and Structures* **11**, 3-31.



Deniz, S., Staubli, T., **1998**. "Oscillating rectangular and octagonal profiles: modeling of fluid forces". *Journal of Fluids and Structures* **12**, 859-882.

Dickens, W.R., **1979**. 'The self-induced vibration of cylindrical structures in fluid flow. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers, Part 2*, **67**, pp. 13-30.

Di Silvio, G., **1969**. Self controlled vibration of cylinder in fluid stream. *ASCE Journal of Engineering Mechanics Division* **95** (EM2), 347-361.

Di Silvio, G., Angrilli, F., Zanardo, A., **1975**. Fluid elastic vibrations: Mathematical model and experimental result. *Meccanica*, 269-278.

Dye, R.C.F., **1978**. Photographic evidence of the mechanisms of vortex-excited vibration. *Journal of Photographic Science* **26**, 203-208.

Evangelinos, C., Karniadakis, G.E., **1999**. Dynamics and flow structures in the turbulent wake of rigid and flexible cylinders subject to vortex-induced vibrations. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **400**, 91-124.

Evangelinos, C., Lucor, D., and Karniadakis, G. E., **2000**. DNS-derived force distribution on flexible cylinders subject to vortex-induced vibration. *Journal of Fluids Structures* **14**, 429-440.

Favre, A., **1965**. Equations des gaz turbulents compressibles. *Journal de Mecanique*, 4(3), 361-90.

Feng, C-C., **1968**. The measurement of vortex induced effects in flow past stationary and oscillating circular and d-section cylinders. Master's Thesis, Department of Mechanical Engineering, the University of British Columbia, Canada.

Ferguson, N., Parkinson, G.V., **1967**. Surface and wake flow phenomena of vortex-excited oscillation of a circular cylinder. *ASME Journal of Engineering for Industry* **89**, 831-838.

Fischer, P.F., Patera, A.T., **1994**. Parallel simulation of viscous incompressible flows. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* **26**, 483-527.

Frederic, L., Laneville, A., **2002**. Vortex-induced vibrations of a flexible cylinder in a slowly varying flow: Experimental results. *Proceedings of IMECE 2002. ASME International Mechanical Engineering Congress and Exposition*, November 17-22, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Gerard, J.H., **1978**. The wake of cylindrical bluff bodies at low Reynolds number. *Philosophical Transactions, A* **288**, 351-382.

Gopalkrishnan, R., **1993**. Vortex induced forces on oscillating bluff cylinders. Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Ocean Engineering, MIT.

Gopalkrishnan, R., Grosenbaugh, M.A., Triantafyllou, M.S., **1992**. Influence of amplitude modulation on the fluid forces acting on a vibrating cylinder in cross-flow. *International Journal of Offshore and Polar Engineering, Transaction of the ISOPE* **2(1)**, 32-37.

Govardhan, R., Williamson, C.H.K., **2000**. Modes of vortex formation and frequency response of a freely vibrating cylinder. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, **420**, 85-130.

Gowda, B. H. L., **1975**. Some measurements on the phenomenon of vortex-shedding and induced vibrations of circular cylinders. Technical Report DLR-FB 75-01, Technische Universitat Berlin.

Grinstein, F.F., Karniadakis, G.E., **2002**. Alternative LES and hybrid RANS/LES for turbulent flows. *Journal of Fluids Engineering* **124**, 821-822.

Griffin, O.M., **1972**. Flow near self excited and forced vibrating circular cylinders. *Journal of Engineering Industry* **94**, 539-547.

Griffin, O.M., Koopmann G.H., **1977**. The vortex-excited lift and reaction forces on resonantly vibrating cylinders. *Journal of Sound Vibration* **54(3)**, 435-448.

Griffin, O.M., Ramberg, S.E., **1974**. The vortex-street wakes of vibrating cylinders. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **66**, 553-576.

Griffin, O.M., Ramberg, S.E., **1982**. Some recent studies of vortex shedding with applications to marine tubulars and risers. *ASME. Journal of Energy Resources Technology* **104**, 2-13.

Griffin, O.M., Skop, R.A., Ramberg, S.E., **1976**. Modeling of the vortex-induced oscillations of cables and bluff structures. Society for Experimental Stress Analysis Spring Meeting, 9-14 May, Silver Spring, MD.

Gu, W., Chyu, C., Rockwell, D., **1994**. Timing of vortex formation from an oscillating cylinder. *Physics of Fluids* **6**, 3677-3682.

Guilmineau, E., Queutey, P., **2001**. Numerical simulation in vortex-induced vibrations at low mass-damping. **AIAA Paper No: 2001-2852**.

Hartlen, R.T., Baines, W.D., Currie, I.G., **1968**. Vortex excited oscillations of a circular cylinder. University of Toronto Report **UTME-TP 6809**. Also see Hartlen, R.T., Currie, I.G., **1970**. Lift oscillation model for vortex-induced vibration. Proceedings ASCE, Journal of Engineering Mechanics division **96**, pp. **577-591**.

Hover, F.S., Miller, S.N., Triantafyllou, M. S., **1997**. Vortex-induced vibration of marine cables: Experiments using force feedback. Journal of Fluid Mechanics **11**, **306-326**.

Hover, F.S., Techet, A.H., Triantafyllou, M.S., **1998**. Forces on oscillating uniform and tapered cylinders in crossflow. Journal of Fluid Mechanics **363**, **97-114**.

Hover, F.S., Davis, J.T., Triantafyllou, M.S., **2002**. Is mode transition three-dimensional? Conference on Bluff Body Wakes and Vortex-Induced Vibrations (BBVIV3), **17-20** December, Port Douglas, Australia.

Huerre, P., **2002**. Global nonlinear instabilities in wake flows. Conference on Bluff Body Wakes and Vortex-Induced Vibrations (BBVIV3), **17-20** December, Port Douglas, Australia.

Humphries, J.A., Walker, D.H., **1988**. Vortex-excited response of large-scale cylinders in sheared flow. Journal of Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering **110**, **272-277**.

Huse, E., Kleiven, G., Nielsen, F.G., **1998**. Large scale model testing of deep sea risers. Offshore Technology Conference, OTC Number **8701**, **4-7** May, Houston, Texas.

Iwan, W.D., Jones, N.P., **1987**. On the vortex-induced oscillations of long structural elements. Journal of Energy Resources Technology **109**, **161-167**.

Jauvtis, N., Williamson, C.H.K., **2002**. Vortex-induced vibration of a cylinder in two degrees of freedom. Conference on Bluff Body Wakes and Vortex-Induced Vibrations (BBVIV3) (4P), **17-20** December.

Jones, G.W., Cincotta J. J., Walker R.W., **1969**. Aerodynamic forces on a stationary and oscillating circular at high Reynolds numbers. Technical Report

NASA R-300: N69-17304. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C.

Jong, J -Y., Vandiver, J.K., 1985. The identification of the quadratic system relating cross-flow and in-line vortex-induced vibration. In Dynamic System Measurement and Control, ASME Winter Annual Meeting.

Keulegan, G.H., Carpenter, L.H., 1958. Forces on cylinders and plates in an oscillating fluid. Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standards 60(5), 423-440.

Khalak, A., Williamson, C.H.K., 1999. Motions, forces and mode transitions in vortex-induced vibrations at low mass-damping. Journal of Fluids and Structures 13, 813-851.

Kim, Y.H., Vandiver, J.K., Holler R., 1986. Vortex-induced vibration and drag coefficients of long cables subjected to sheared flow. Journal of Energy Resources Technology 108, 77-83.

Koopmann, G.H., 1967a. On the wind-induced vibrations of circular cylinders. Masters Thesis. Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

Koopmann, G.H., 1967b. The vortex wakes of vibrating cylinders at low Reynolds numbers. Journal of Fluid Mechanics 28, 501-512.

Krishnamoorthy, S., Price, S.J., Paidoussis, M.P., 2001. Cross-flow past an oscillating circular cylinder: Synchronization phenomena in the near wake. Journal of Fluids and Structures 15, 955-980.

Laguë, F., Laneville, A., 2002. Vortex-induced vibrations of a flexible cylinder in a slowly varying flow: Experimental results. Proceedings of ASME International Mechanical Engineering Congress and Exposition, New Orleans, Louisiana, pp. 1-7.

Lecointe, Y., Piquet, J., 1989. Flow structure in the wake of an oscillating cylinder. Journal of Fluids Engineering 111, 139-148.

Lenarts, V., Kerschen, G., Golival, J.C., 2001. Proper orthogonal decomposition for updating of non-linear mechanical systems. Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing 15(1), 31-43.

Lighthill, M.J., 1986. Fundamentals concerning wave loading on offshore structures. Journal of Fluid Mechanics 173, 667-681.

Loève, M., 1977. Probability Theory. 4th ed. Springer, New York.

Lotfy, A., Rockwell, D., 1993. The near wake on an oscillating trailing edge. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 251, 173-201.

Lu, X-Y., Dalton, C., 1996. Calculation of the timing of vortex formation from an oscillating cylinder. *Journal of Fluids and Structures* 10, 527-541.

Lucor, D., Karniadakis, G.E. 2002. Predictability and uncertainty in flow-structure interactions. Conference on Bluff Body Wakes and Vortex-Induced Vibrations (BBVTV3), 17-20 December, Port Douglas, Australia.

Lucor, D., Foo, J., Karniadakis, G.E. 2003. Correlation length and force phasing of a rigid cylinder subject to VIV. IUTAM Symposium on Fluid-Structure Interactions. June 2003, Rutgers State University.

Mandini, R.V., 1961. Kinematics of vortices in the early wake of vibrating circular cylinders. Masters Thesis, University of California, Berkeley.

Mansy, H., Yang, P-M., Williams, D.R., 1994. Quantitative measurements of three-dimensional structures in the wake of a circular cylinder. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 270, 227-296.

Marcollo H., Hinwood, J.B., 2002. Vortex-induced-vibration of a long flexible cylinder in uniform flow with both forcing and response. Conference on Bluff Body Wakes and Vortex-Induced-Vibrations (BBVTV3), Port Douglas, Australia.

Marris, A.W., Brown, O.G., 1963. Hydrodynamically excited vibrations of cantilever-supported probes. ASME Paper No. 62, Hyd-7.

Masri, F., Caughey, T.K., 1979. A Non-parametric identification technique for non-linear dynamic problems. *Journal of Applied Mechanics* 46, 433-447.

Mei, V.C., Currie, I.G., 1969. Flow separation on a vibrating cylinder. *Physics of Fluids* 12, 2248-2254.

Meier-Windhorst, A., 1939. Flatterschwingungen von Zylindern in gleichmassigen Flussigkeitsstrom. Mitteilungen des hydraulischen Instituts der Technischen Hochschule, München, Heft 9, 3-39.

Meneghini, J.R., Saltara, F., Fregonesi, R.A., Yamamoto, C.T., Ferrari Jr., J.A., **2002**. Numerical simulations of **VW** on long flexible cylinders immersed in complex flow fields. Conference on Bluff Body Wakes and Vortex-Induced Vibrations (**BBVIV3**), **17-20** December, **Port** Douglas, Australia.

Mercier, J.A., **1973**. Large amplitude oscillations of a circular cylinder in a low-spced stream. Ph.D. Thesis, Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, New Jersey.

Meskell, **C.**, Fitzpatrick, J.A., Rice, H.J., 2001. Application of force-state mapping to a non-linear fluid elastic system. Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing **15**(1), **75-85**.

Moe, **G.**, Wu, Z-J., **1990**. The lift force on a cylinder vibrating in a current. ASME Journal of Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering **112**, **297-303**.

Moe, G., Holden, K., Yttervoll, **P.O.**, **1994**. Motion of spring supported cylinders in subcritical and critical water flows. Proceedings of the 4th International Offshore and Polar Engineering Conference 3, Osaka, Japan, pp. **468-475**.

Molin, B., 2002. Hydrodynamique des Structures Offshore. Editions Technip, **Paris**, 2002.

Morison, J.R., O'Brien, M.P., Johnson, J.W., Schaaf, S.A., 1950. The force **exerted** by surface waves on piles. Petroleum Transactions. AIME **189**, 149-154.

Nakano, M., Rockwell, D., **1991**. The wake from a cylinder subjected to amplitude modulated excitation. Draft.

Naudascher, E., Rockwell, D., **1994**. Flow-Induced Vibrations. **An** Engineering Guide, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam.

Newman, D.J., Karniadakis G.E., **1997**. Simulations of flow past a freely vibrating cable. Journal of Fluid Mechanics **344**, **95-136**.

Norberg, C., **2003**. Fluctuating lift on a circular cylinder: Review and New Measurements. Journal of Fluids and Structures **17**, **57-96**.

Novak, M., Tanaka, H., 1975. Pressure correlations on a vibrating cylinder. In: Eaton, K.J. (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Wind Effects on Buildings and Structures*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 227-232 and 273.

Okajima, A., Nagamori, T., Matsunaga, F., Kiwata, T., 1999. Some experiments on flow-induced vibration of a circular cylinder with surface roughness. *Journal of Fluids and Structures* 13, 853-864.

Okajima, A., Nakamura, A., Kosugi, T., Uchida, H., 2002. Flow-induced in-line oscillation of a circular cylinder. *Conference on Bluff Body wakes and vortex-Induced Vibrations, (BBVIV3)*, Port Douglas, Australia.

Olinger, D.J., Sreenivasan, K.R., 1988. Nonlinear dynamics of the wake of an oscillating cylinder. *Physical Review Letters* 60,797-800.

Ongoren, A., Rockwell, D., 1988a. Flow structure from an oscillating cylinder. Part 1. Mechanisms of phase shift and recovery in the near wake. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 191, 197-223.

Ongoren, A., Rockwell, D., 1988b. Flow structure from an oscillating cylinder. Part 2. Mode competition in the near wake. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 191, 225-245.

Pantazopoulos, M.S., 1994. Vortex-induced vibration parameters: Critical Review of the 13th International Conference on Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering 1, 199-255.

Parkinson, G.V., 1974. Mathematical models of flow-induced vibrations of bluff bodies. In: Naudascher, E. (Ed.), *Flow-Induced Structural Vibrations*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, pp. 81-127.

Parkinson, G.V., 1989. Phenomena and modeling of flow-induced vibrations of bluff bodies. *Progress in Aerospace Sciences* 26, 169-224.

Patrikalakis N.M., Chrysostomidis, C., 1986. Vortex induced response of a flexible cylinder in a sheared current. *Journal of Energy Resources Technology, Transactions of the ASME*, 108, 59-64.

Pesce, C.P., Fuarra, A.L.C., 2000. Vortex-induced vibrations and jump phenomenon: Experiments with a clamped flexible cylinder in water. *International Journal of Offshore Polar Engineering* 10, 26-33.

Protos, A., Goldschmidt, V.W., Toebes G.H., **1968**. Hydroelastic forces on bluff cylinders. *Journal of Basic Engineering* **90**, 378-386.

Ramberg, S.E., **Griffin**, O.M., **1976**. The effects of vortex coherence, spacing and circulation on the flow-induced forces on vibrating cables and bluff structures. Report **7945**, Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C.

Raudkivi, A.J., Small, A.F., **1974**. Hydroelastic excitation of cylinders. *Journal of Hydraulic Research* **12** (1), 99-131.

Riecke, E., **1888**. Notes on hydrodynamics. (in German). *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Gottingen*. 11, **Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse**. 347-450.

Rodriguez, O., Pruvost, J., **2000**. Wakes of an oscillating cylinder. **IUTAM** Symposium, June **13-16**, Marseille, France.

Roshko, A., **1961**. Experiments on the flow past a circular cylinder at very high Reynolds number. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **10**, 345-356.

Sainsbury, R.N., King, D., **1971**. The flow induced oscillation of marine structures. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers* **49**, pp. 269-302.

Saltara, F., Meneghini, J.R., Siqueira, C.R., Bearman, P.W., **1998**. The simulation of vortex shedding from an oscillating circular cylinder with turbulence modeling. FEDSM98-5 **189** in CD-ROM from ASME.

Sarkar A., Païdoussis, M.P., 2003. A compact limit-cycle oscillation model of a cantilever conveying fluid. *Journal of Fluids and Structures* **17**, 525-539.

Sarpkaya, T., **1963**. Lift, Drag and added mass coefficients for a circular cylinder immersed in a time-dependent flow. *Journal of Applied Mechanics* **30**, 13-18.

Sarpkaya, T., **1976a**. Vortex shedding and resistance in harmonic flow about smooth and rough circular cylinders at high Reynolds numbers. Technical Report No: **NPS-59SL76021**, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, **CA**.

Sarpkaya, T., **1976b**. In-Line and transverse forces on smooth and sand-roughened cylinders in oscillatory flow at high Reynolds number. Naval Postgraduate School Technical Report No: **NPS-69L76062**, Monterey, **California**.



Sarpkaya, T., **1977a**. In-line and transverse forces on cylinders in oscillatory flow at high Reynolds numbers. *Journal of Ship Research* **21(4)**, **200-216**.

Sarpkaya, T., **1977b**. Transverse oscillations of a circular cylinder in uniform flow. Part 1. Technical Report **NPS-69SL77071**, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California.

Sarpkaya, T., **1978**. Fluid forces on oscillating cylinders. *Journal of Waterway Port Coastal and Ocean Division ASCE*, **WW4**, **104(WW4)**, **275 -290**.

Sarpkaya, T., **1979**. Vortex-induced oscillations, A Selective Review. *Journal of Applied Mechanics*, **ASME 46(2)**, **241-258**.

Sarpkaya, T., **1981**. Morison's equation and the wave forces on offshore structures. Technical Report **CR 82 008**. Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory, Department of the Navy, Port Hueneme, California.

Sarpkaya, T., **1985**. Past progress and outstanding problems in time-dependent flows about ocean structures. *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Separated Flow Around Marine Structures*, Norwegian Institute of Technology, Trondheim, Norway, pp. **1-36**.

Sarpkaya, T., **1986a**. In-line transverse forces on smooth and rough cylinder in oscillary flow at high Reynolds numbers. Technical report No. **NPS-69-86-003**. Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California.

Sarpkaya, T., **1986b**. Force on a circular cylinder in viscous oscillatory flow at low Keulegan-Carpenter numbers. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* **165**, **61-71**.

Sarpkaya, T., **1987**. Oscillating flow about smooth and rough cylinders. *Proceedings of the 6th International Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering Symposium*, Houston, Texas, pp. **113-121**.

Sarpkaya, T., **1989**. Computational methods with vortices – the **1988** Freeman Scholar Lecture. *Journal of Fluids Engineering* **111**, **5-51**.

Sarpkaya, T., **1991**. Non-impulsively started steady flow about a circular cylinder. *AIAA Journal* **29(8)**, **1283-1289**.

Sarpkaya, T., **1994**. Unsteady Flows: A Selective Review. In Schetz, J.A. (Ed.), *Handbook of Fluid Dynamics*, McGraw-Hill, New York, **NY**.

Sarpkaya, T., 1995. Hydrodynamic damping, flow-induced oscillations, and biharmonic response. *ASME Journal of Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering* 117, 232-238.

Sarpkaya, T., 1996a. Unsteady Flows. In: Schetz, J.A. Fuhs, A.E., (Eds.), *Handbook of Fluid Dynamics and Fluid Machinery*, John Wiley and Sons Vol. 1, pp. 697-732.

Sarpkaya, T., 1996b. Interaction of vorticity, free-surface, and surfactants *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics* 28, 83-128.

Sarpkaya, T., 2000. Resistance in Unsteady Flow: Search for an in-line force model. *International Journal of Offshore and Polar Engineering*, December 10(4), 1053-5381.

Sarpkaya, T., 2001. On the force decompositions of Lighthill and Morrison. *Journal of Fluids and Structures* 15, 227-233.

Sarpkaya, T., 2002. Taylor-Gortler instability and separation on a cylinder in sinusoidally oscillating flow. *Proceedings of the IUTAM Symposium on Unsteady Flows*, Toulouse, France.

Sarpkaya, T., 2003. Fluid forces on oscillating cylinders at seven Reynolds numbers ( $2.5 \times 10^3$ ,  $7.5 \times 10^3$ ,  $12.5 \times 10^3$ ,  $15 \times 10^3$ ,  $20 \times 10^3$ , and  $45 \times 10^3$ ). (Technical Report, in preparation).

Sarpkaya, T., Butterworth, W., 1992. Separation points on a cylinder in oscillating flow. *Transactions of the ASME*, 114, 28-35.

Sarpkaya, T., Shoaff, R.L., 1979. A discrete-vortex analysis of flow about stationary and transversely oscillating circular cylinders. Technical Report NPS-69SL79011, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California.

Schewe, G., 1983. On the force fluctuations acting on a circular cylinder in cross-flow from subcritical up to transcritical Reynolds numbers. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 133, 265-285.

Shih, W.C.L., Wang, W.C.L., Coles, D., Roshko, A., 1992. Experiments on flow past rough circular cylinders at large Reynolds numbers, 2<sup>nd</sup> International Colloquium on Bluff Body Aerodynamics and Applications, December 7-10, Melbourne, Australia.

Skop. R.A., Balasubramanian, S., 1997. A new twist on an old model for vortex-excited vibrations. *Journal of Fluid Structures* 11,395-412.

Stansby, P.K., 1976. The Locking-on of vortex shedding due to the cross-stream vibration of circular cylinders in uniform and shear flows. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 74(4), 641-665.

Staubli, T., 1983. Calculation of the vibration of an elastically mounted cylinder using experimental data from forced oscillation. *Journal of Fluids Engineering, Transactions of ASME*, 105,225-229.

Stokes, G.G., (Sir) 1851. On the effect of the internal friction of fluids on the motion of pendulums. *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 9, 8-106.

Sugimoto, T., Saito, S., Matsuda, K., Okajima, A., Kiwata, T., Kosugi, T., 2002. Water tunnel experiments on in-line oscillation of a circular cylinder with a finite span length. *Conference on Bluff Body Wakes and Vortex-Induced Vibrations, (BBVIV3)*, Port Douglas, Australia.

Sumer, B.M., Fredsøe, J., 1988. Transverse vibrations of an elastically mounted cylinder exposed to an oscillating flow. *Journal of Offshore Mechanics and Arctic Engineering, ASME* 110,387-394

Sumer, B.M., Fredsøe, J., 1997. *Hydrodynamics around cylindrical structures*. Singapore: World Scientific.

Taylor, G.I., 1928a. The energy of a body moving in an infinite fluid, with an application to airships. *Proceedings of Royal Society of London, A* 120, pp. 13-20.

Taylor, G.I., 1928b. The forces on a body placed in a curved or converging stream of fluid. *Proceedings of Royal Society of London, A* 120, pp. 260-283.

Toebe, G.H., 1969. The unsteady flow and wake near an oscillating cylinder. *Journal of Basic Engineering, Transactions ASME* 91,493-502.

Triantafyllou, M.S., Davis, J.T., Hover, F.S., Landolt, A., 2001. Vortex induced vibrations of cylinders in a tandem arrangement. *Proceedings of the 4th Symposium on Cable Dynamics, May 2001, Montreal, Quebec*.

Triantafyllou, **M.S.**, Techet, A.H., Hover, **F.S.**, Yue, D.K.P., 2003. VIV of slender structures in shear flow. IUTAM Symposium on Flow-Structure Interactions, June 2003, Rutgers State University.

Tutar, M., Holdo, A. E., 2000. Large eddy simulation of a smooth circular cylinder oscillating normal to a uniform flow. Transactions of the ASME 122, 694-702.

Unal, F., Rockwell, D., 1988. Vortex formation from a cylinder: Part I-The initial instability, and Part II - Control by wake interference. Journal of Fluid Mechanics 190,491-512.

Vandiver, J.K., 1993. Dimensionless parameters important to the prediction of vortex-induced vibration of long, flexible cylinders in ocean currents. Journal of Fluids and Structures 7,423-455.

Vandiver, J.K., Jong, J-Y., 1987. The relationship between in-line and cross-flow vortex-induced vibration of cylinders. Journal of Fluids and Structures 1, 381-399.

Vickery, B.J., Watkins, R.D., 1962. Flow induced vibration of cylindrical structures. Proceedings of the First Australian Conference. University of Western Australia.

Vickery, B.J., Watkins, R.D., 1964. Flow-induced vibrations of cylindrical structures. In: Silvester, R. (Ed.), Proceedings of the 1st Australian Conference on Hydraulics and Fluid Mechanics, Pergamon.

Vikestad, K., Vandiver, J.K., Larsen, C.M., 2000. Added mass and oscillation frequency for a circular cylinder subjected to vortex-induced vibrations and external disturbance. Journal of Fluids and Structures 14, 1071-1088.

Voorhees, A., Wei, T., **2002**. Three-dimensionality in the wake of a surface piercing cylinder mounted as an inverted pendulum. Conference on Bluff Body Wakes and Vortex-Induced Vibrations (BBVIV3), **17-20** December, Port Douglas, Australia.

Wei, T., Smith, C.R., 1986. Secondary vortices in the wake of circular cylinders. Journal of Fluid Mechanics 169,513-533.

Williamson, C.H.K., Roshko, A., 1988. Vortex formation in the wake of an oscillating cylinder. Journal of Fluids and Structures 2, 355-381

Wu, Z.-J., 1989. Current induced vibrations of a flexible cylinder. P.h.D. Thesis, Civil Engineering, the Norwegian Institute of Technology.

Zdravkovich, M.M., 1981. Review and classification of various aerodynamic and hydrodynamic means for suppressing vortex shedding. *Journal of Wind Engineering and Industrial Aerodynamics* 7, 145-189.

Zdravkovich, M.M., 1982. Modification of vortex shedding in the synchronization range. *Journal of Fluids Engineering* 104, 513-517.

Zdravkovich, M.M., 1990. On origins of hysteretic responses of a circular cylinder induced by vortex shedding. *Zeitschrift for Flugwissenschaft und Weltraumforschung* 14, 47-58.

Zdravkovich, M.M., 1996. Different Modes of vortex shedding: An overview. *Journal of Fluids and Structures* 10, 427-437.

Zdravkovich, M.M., 1997. Flow around circular cylinders- Vol 1: Fundamentals. Oxford University Press, Oxford, England.

Zdravkovich, M.M., 2003. Flow around circular cylinders- Vol 2: Applications. Oxford University Press, Oxford, England.

Zhang, J., Dalton, C., 1996. Interaction of vortex-induced vibration of a circular cylinder and a steady approach flow at a Reynolds number of 13,000. *Computers and Fluids* 25, 283-294.

Zhou, C.Y., So, R.M., Lam, K., 1999. Vortex-induced vibrations of elastic circular cylinders. *Journal of Fluids and Structures* 13, 165-189.

Ziada, S., Staubli, T., 2000. Flow-Induced Vibration. A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Brookfield.

## INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

Defense Technical Information center 8725 John J. Kingman Rd. <b>STE 0944</b> Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6218	2
Dudley Knox Library, Code 013 Naval Postgraduate School 411 Dyer Rd. Monterey, CA <b>93943-5101</b>	2
Research Office, Code 09 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA <b>93943-5138</b>	2
Curricular Officer, Code 34 Naval Engineering Department Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA <b>93943-5000</b>	1
Department Chairman, Code ME Department of Mechanical Engineering Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA <b>93943-5000</b>	2
Department of Ocean Engineering Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, Massachusetts <b>021 139</b> Department Library	1
Harvard University Pierce Hall Cambridge, Massachusetts <b>021 138</b> ATTN: Gordon McKay Library	1
Library of Congress Science and <b>Technology</b> Division Washington, D. C. <b>20540</b>	2

Director Defense Documentation Center 5010 Duke Street Alexandria, Virginia 223 14	2
Dr. Owais Ahmad Stevens Institute of Technology Dept. of Civil Engineering Hoboken, New Jersey. 07030	1
Dr. James Allen Department of Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering Princeton University E-Quad, Olden St. Princeton, NJ 08540	1
Dr. Helge I. Andersson Division of Applied Mechanics Norwegian University of Science & Technology N-749 1 Trondheim - Norway	1
Dr. Sathish Balasubramanian Structural Engineering/Offshore Division Exxon-Mobil Upstream Research Company 3319 Mercer Street, Houston, TX 77027-6019	1
Dr. Michael Barton Analytical Methods, Inc. 2133 152nd Ave., <b>NE</b> Redmond, WA 98052	1
Dr. Francoise Bataille CETHIL, UMR 5008 CNRS INSA de Lyon Batiment Sadi Carnot 20, Avenue Albert Einstein 69621 Villeurbanne Cedex - France	1

Dr. Peter W. Bearman  
Department of Aeronautics  
Imperial College of Science,  
Technology & Medicine  
Prince Consort Road  
London SW7 2BY – United Kingdom

1

Dr. Haym Benaroya  
Rutgers University  
Dept. of Mechanical & Aerospace Eng.  
98 Brett Rd.  
Piscataway NJ, 08854

1

Professor Stanley A. Berger  
Mechanical Engineering  
UC Berkeley  
Berkeley, CA 94720

1

Dr. Somath Bhattacharyya  
Indian Institute of Technology  
Kharagpur, India

1

Dr. Hugh M. Blackburn  
Building Construction & Engineering  
CSIRO  
PO Box 56  
Highett, VIC 3190 – Australia

1

Dr. Robert D. Blevins  
Mail Zone 29R  
~~Rohr~~ Industries, Inc.  
P. O. Box 878  
Chula Vista, CA 92012-0878

1

Dr. Valerie Blondeau  
Department Recherche & Developement  
CGG Marine  
1, rue Leon Migaux  
91341 Massy Cedex – France

1



Dr. Louis Boyer <b>IRPHE</b> <b>CNRS</b> / Universites Aix-Marseille I & II Facultes de Saint-Jerome Service252 13997 Marseille Cedex 20 – France	1
Dr. Gilles Bouchet Institut de Mechanique des Fluides CNRS/Universite Louis Pasteur 2,rue Boussingault 67000 Strasbourg–France	1
Dr. Christoph Brucker Aerodynamisches Institut RWTH Aachen Wullnersts. zw. 5 u. 7 D-52056 Aachen – Germany	1
Dr. James Buchholz Princeton University D-214 Eng. Quadrangle Olden St., Princeton NJ, 08544	1
Dr. Guido Buresti Dipartimento di IngegneriaAerospaziale Universita di Pisa Via Diotisalvi, 2 1-56126Pisa – Italy	1
Dr. Oliver Cadot Labroratoire de Mecanique Universite du Havre 25, rue Philippe Lebon B.P. 540 76058 le Havre Cedex– France	1
Dr. Jean-Michel Canavese <b>IRPHE</b> <b>CNRS</b> / Universites Aix-Marseiile I & II 12 avenue General Leclerc 13003 Marseille – France	1

Dr. Josie Carberry Department of Mechanical Engineering Monash University Clayton, VIC 3168 – Australia	1
Dr. George F. Carnevale SCRIPPS 8946 La Jolla Village Dr. N La Jolla, CA 92037	1
Dr. John R. Chaplin Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering University of Southampton Southampton SO17 1BJ – United Kingdom	1
Dr. Marie Pierre Chauve IRPHE CNRS / Universites Aix-Marseille I & II 12 avenue General Leclerc 13003 Marseille – France	1
Dr. Yong Tian Chew Department of Mechanical & Production Engineering National University of Singapore 10 Kent Ridge Crescent Singapore 117575 – Singapore	1
Dr. Todd Cowen Dept. of Civil Engr., MC 4020 Stanford University Stanford, CA 94305	1
Dr. Dominic S. Cusanelli Code 521, CD/NSWC DTMB Bethesda, MD 20084	1

Dr. Charles Dalton  
Mechanical engineering Department  
University of Houston.  
Houston, TX 77204-4792

1

Dr. Rupad Darekar  
Department of Aeronautics  
Imperial College of Science,  
Technology & Medicine  
Prince Consort Road  
London SW7 2BY – United Kingdom

Dr. Kevin Dempsey  
Clarkson University  
Box 5815  
Potsdam NJ, 13699

1

Dr. W. R. Dickens  
Thames Polytechnic  
School of Civil Engineering  
Division of Hydraulics  
Wellington Street  
London, SE18 6PF

1

Dr. Earl Dowell  
Duke University  
185 Hudson Hall  
Box 90300  
Durham NC, 27708

1

Dr. Stephane Etienne  
Bureau Veritas  
17bis. place des Reflets  
92400 Paris La Defense – France

1

Dr. Matteo Luca Facchinetti  
Laboratoire d'Hydrodynamique  
CNRS / Ecole Polytechnique  
route de Saclay  
91128 Palaiseau Cedex – France

1

Dr. Katsuhisa Fujita Osaka Prefecture University Graduate School of Eng. 1-1Gaku Encho Sakai Osaka, <b>599-8531</b> Japan	1
Dr. Thomas Gautherot Techniques Avancees TOTALFINA ELF <b>24</b> , cours Michelet <b>92069</b> Paris La Defense – France	1
Professor Howard Gibeling Pennsylvania State Univ. Applied Research Lab. P. O. Box30 State College, PA <b>16804</b>	1
Dr. Seckin Gokaltun Istanbul Techincal University Bilisim Enstitusu Istanbul <b>34469</b> , Turkey	1
Dr. Ram Gopalkrishnan Staff Engineer, Systems Development Shell International Exploration and Production Inc., EP Projects 200 North Dairy Ashford, Houston, Texas 77079	1
Dr. Raghuraman Govardhan Indian Institute of Science Mechanical EngineeringIISc Bangalore <b>560012</b> , India	1
Dr. Emmanuel Guilmineau Laboratoire de Mecanique des Fluides Ecole Centrale de Nantes <b>B.P. 92101</b> <b>44321</b> Nantes Cedex 3 – France	1

Professor Kelli Hendrickson MIT 5-333, 77 Mass Ave. Cambridge, MA 02139	1
Dr. Hiroshi Higuchi Institute of Fluid Science Tohoku University 2-1-1 Katahira Aoba-Ku Sendai 980-8577 – Japan	1
Professor Munehiko Hinatsu Ship Research Institute Shinkawa 6-38-1, Mitaka Tokyo, 181 JAPAN	1
Dr. Kerry Hourigan Department of Mechanical Engineering Monash University Clayton, VIC 3168 – Australia	1
Dr. Franz S. Hover Department of Ocean Engineering Massachusetts Institute of Technology 77 Massachusetts Avenue Cambridge, MA 02142	1
Professor Leonard Imas MIT, Dept. of Ocean Engr., 5-331 77 Massachusetts Ave. Cambridge, MA 02139	1
Dr. Woo-Pyung Jeon Center for Turbulence & Flow Control Research Seoul National University Institute of Advanced Machinery & Design Seoul 151-742 – Korea	1

Dr. Juan Jimenez 1  
 Princeton University  
 D214 Eng. Quadrangle  
 Olden St.,  
 Princeton NJ, **08544**

Dr. Peter Johansson 1  
 Thermo & Fluid Dynamics  
 Chalmers University of Technology  
 Horsalsvagen 7  
 SE-41296 Goteborg – Sweden

Professor George Karniadakis 1  
 Brown University  
 Division of Appl. Math., Box F  
 Prospect St.  
 Providence, **RI 02912**

Dr. Serpil Kocabiyik 1  
 Memorial University  
 Dept. of Mathematics and Statistics  
 St. John's, Newfoundland, A1C5S7  
 Canada

Dr. Masaru Kiya 1  
 Graduate School of Engineering  
 Hokkaido University  
 Division of Mechanical Science  
 Kita 13, Nishi 8, Kita-ku  
 Sapporo **060-8628** - Japan

Professor **A. Laneville** 1  
 Department de genie mecanique,  
 Universite de Sherbrooke,  
 Sherbrooke, Quebec, J1K 2R1, Canada

Dr. Jean Lemay 1  
 Department de Genie Mecanique  
 Universite Laval, Sainte-Foy  
 Laboratoire de Mecanique des Fluids  
 Sainte-Foy, Quebec **G1K 7P4** – Canada

Dr. Thomas Leweke 1

**IRPHE**

CNRS/ Universites Aix-Marseille I & II

12 Avenue General Leclerc

13003 Marseille – France

Dr. Didier Lucor 1

Center for Fluid Mech., Turbulence & Comp.

Brown University

Division of Applied Mathematics

182 George St., Box F

Providence, RI 02912

Dr. Geoffrey Lyons 1

BPP Technical Services Ltd

Dilke House 1 Malet St

London WC1E7JN

United Kingdom

Dr. Hayden Marcollo 1

Department of Mechanical Engineering

Monash University

Wellington Road

Clayton, VIC 3168 – Australia

Dr. Philippe Marcq 1

**IRPHE**

CNRS/ Universites Aix-Marseille I & II

12 Avenue General Leclerc

13003 Marseille – France

Dr. Lionel Mathelin 1

CETHIL, UMR 5008 CNRS

INSA de Lyon

Batiment Sadi Carrot

20, avenue Albert Einstein

69621 Villeurbanne Cedex – France

Dr. Pierre Maubert 1

Department Genie Thermique et Energetique

IUT – Universite Aix-Marseille III

142, traverse Charles Susini

13388 Marseille Cedex 13 – France

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Dr. Julio Romano Meneghini<br>Mechanical Engineering Department<br>University of Sao Paulo, EPUSP<br>Av. Prof. Mello de Moraes, <b>2231</b><br>CEP <b>05508-900</b> Sao Paulo, <b>SP</b> – Brazil | 1 |
| Prof. Geir Moe<br>Department of Structural Engineering<br>Faculty of Civil and Environmental Eng.<br>NTNU, N-7491 Trondheim, Norway   | 1 |
| Dr. Bernard Molin<br>IMT Technopole de Chateau-Gombert<br><b>13451</b> MARSEILLE Cedex 20   | 1 |
| Dr. Christoffer Norberg<br>Division of Heat Transfer<br>Lund Institute of Technology<br>Ole Romer vag I<br>P.O. <b>Box 118</b><br>S-22 <b>100</b> Lund – Sweden                                   | 1 |
| Dr. Owen H. Oakley, Jr.,<br>Sr. Advisor<br>ChevronTexaco<br>Exploration & Production Technology Company<br><b>6001</b> Bollinger Canyon Rd., Rm. L-4228,<br>San Ramon, CA <b>94583</b>            | 1 |
| Dr. John Owen<br>Department of Aeronautics<br>Imperial College of Science,<br>Technology & Medicine<br>Prince Consort Road<br>London SW7 <b>2BY</b> – United Kingdom                              | 1 |
| Dr. Michael P. Paidoussis<br>Department of Mechanical Engineering<br>McGill University<br><b>817</b> Sherbrooke Street West<br>Montreal, Quebec <b>H3A 2K6</b> – Canada                           | 1 |



Dr. Paul Palo Naval Facilities Engineering Service Center ESC 51 1100 23rd Ave. Port Hueneme CA 93043	1
Dr. Celso P. Pesce Dept. of Mechanical Engineering Escola Politecnica University of Sao Paulo Av. Prof. Mello Moraes, <b>2231</b> CEP <b>05508-900</b> Sao Paulo, SP – Brazil	1
Dr. Benoit Pier Laboratoire d'Hydrodynamique CNRS / Ecole Polytechnique 91 <b>128</b> Palaiseau Cedex – France	1
Dr. Michel Provansal <b>IRPHE</b> CNRS / Universites Aix-Marseille I & II Faculties de Saint-Jerome Service 252 13997 Marseille Cedex 20 – France	1
Professor Donald O. Rockwell Department of Mechanical Engr. Lehigh University, <b>354</b> Packard 19 19 Memorial Drive, West Bethlehem, PA <b>18015-3085</b>	1
Dr. Ovide Rodriguez IMFL/DAAP <b>ONERA</b> 5, Boulevard Paul Painleve <b>59045</b> Lille Cedex – France	1
Dr. Anatol Roshko Graduate Aeronautical Laboratories California Institute of Technology Mail Code 105-50 Pasadena, CA 91125	1

Dr. Robeert Sexton 1  
 Starmark Offshore, Inc.  
**416** Maple Lane  
 Danvill, VA **24541**

Dr. John Sheridan 1  
 College of Engineering  
 Monash University  
 Victorio 3800 Australia

Dr. Cesareo L. R. Siqueira 1  
 Department of Naval Engineering  
 University of Sao Paulo, EPUSP  
 Av. Paes de Barros, **1000** apto **101**  
 Mooca **CEP 03 114-000**  
 Sao Paulo – Brazil

Dr. G.Susbielles 1  
 3 rue Paul Napoleon Roinard  
**92400** Courbevoie, Paris  
 FRANCE

Dr. Peter K. Stansby 1  
 Department of Civil &  
 Structural Engineering  
**UMIST**  
**P. O Box 88**  
 Manchester M60 1QD – United Kingdom

Dr. Thomas Swean 2  
 Program Manager  
 Ocean Technology Program, Code 321 T  
 Office of Naval Research  
**SOON**.Quincy St.  
 Arlington, VA **22217-5660**

Dr. Albin Szewczyk 1  
 Aerospace & Mechanical Engineering  
 University of Notre Dame  
**109** Hessert Center for Aerospace Research  
 Notre Dame, IN **46556**

Dr. Michael Triantafyllou Department of Ocean Engineering Massachusetts Institute of Technology Mail Code <b>5-323</b> <b>77</b> Massachusetts Avenue Cambridge, MA <b>02139</b>	1
Prof. Fevzi Unal Chairman, Aeronautical Engineering Dept. Istanbul Technical University Faculty of Aeronautics and Astronautics Istanbul, Turkey	1
Dr. Brice Valles Department of Applied Mechanics, Thermodynamics, & Fluid Dynamics Norwegian University of Science & Technology <b>N-7491</b> Trondheim – Norway	1
Dr. J. Kim Vandiver <b>MIT</b> Room <b>7-133</b> Cambridge MA, <b>02139</b>	1
Dr. Emmanuel Villiermaux <b>IRPHE</b> <b>CNRS</b> / Universites Aix-Marseille I & II Facultes de Saint-Jerome	1
Dr. Abe Vorhees Rutgers University Dept. of Mechanical & Aerospace Eng. <b>98</b> Brett Rd Piscataway, NJ, <b>08854</b>	1
Professor Timothy Wei Dept. of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering Rutgers University <b>98</b> Brett Rd Piscataway NJ, <b>08854</b>	1
Professor Charles Williamson <b>252</b> Upson Hall	1

Cornell University  
144 Upson Hall  
Ithaca, **NY** 14853-7501

Professor Jie-Zhi Wu  
University of Tennessee  
Space Institute  
Tullahoma, TN 37388

1

Professor Dick K.P. Yue  
Dept. of Ocean Engineering(5-321)  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, MA 02139

1

Professor Ronald W. Yeung  
Dept. of Naval Architecture and Offshore Engineering,  
University of California, Berkeley  
Berkeley, CA 94720

1

Dr. M.M. Zdravkovich  
Mechanical Engineering  
University of Salford  
Salford M5 4WT, England

1

Dr. Yu Zhou  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic Univ  
Hung Hom, Kowloon  
Hong Kong

1

Dr. Baoshan Zhu  
Department of Mechanical Engineering  
& Materials Science  
Yokohama National University  
79-5 Tokiwadai  
Hodogaya-ku  
Yokohama 240-8501 – Japan

1